5-2018

The styles of criminology : writing among the stars.

Ethan Maxwell Higgins
University of Louisville

THE STYLES OF CRIMINOLOGY:

WRITING AMONG THE STARS

By
Ethan Maxwell Higgins
B.S., Eastern Kentucky University, 2010
M.A., Eastern Kentucky University, 2013

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in Criminal Justice

Department of Criminal Justice
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2018

THE STYLES OF CRIMINOLOGY:

WRITING AMONG THE STARS

By

Ethan Higgins
B.A., Eastern Kentucky University, 2010
M.S., Eastern Kentucky University, 2013

A Dissertation Defense Approved on

March 05, 2018

by the following Dissertation Committee:

_____

Dissertation Chair
Kristin Swartz

_____

Bradley Campbell

_____

Benjamin Fisher

_____

Andrea Olinger

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the continued narrative of socio-cultural writing styles promoted in this dissertation, my individual style represents a pastiche of the mentors, colleagues and loved ones that have made this dissertation possible. In both rhetoric and content, the culmination of this dissertation is a product of the tireless efforts—and at times, the relentless endurance—of those that surround me. In turn, I want to express the deepest gratitude for the endless aid and contribution to the scholar I have turned out to be. This dissertation is dedicated to the scores of scholars I have tried to emulate throughout my life. In training, I have garnered my creativity from Eastern Kentucky University and my clarity from the University of Louisville. In reading, I have closely admired and thank Michel Foucault, Zygmunt Bauman, Judith Butler, and Friedrich Nietzsche for their work. As "mentor-texts," I have closely tried to emulate the maneuvers of Dimitri Bogazianos in *5 Grams*, of Avery Gordon in *Ghostly Matters,* of Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian in *Criminality in Spaces of Death*, of Travis Linnemann in *Capote's Ghosts*, and of Stanley Cohen in *The States of Denial.* Additionally, I must express gratitude to the scholars found in the pages of this study who were generous with their time and who most literally graciously delivered their writing styles through conversation.

Likewise, the writing identity that emanates from the pages of this dissertation demonstrates an intermediary position between scholars that I have worked closely with throughout my graduate career. Of these, I want to express unrelenting gratitude to Dr. Kristin Swartz, who fulfilled her promise to always keep my writing grounded and my

ideas from floating too far into the clouds. I want to thank you for stepping in when it mattered most and for your endless counsel. I also want to thank you for your open-mindedness and willingness to view the world through different lenses—a surprisingly rare gift. I want to thank Dr. Bradley Campbell and Dr. Ben Fisher, for taking a chance investing in a graduate student and accepting that this meant entertaining often foreign ideas and interests. I also want to thank Dr. Andrea Olinger, for acting as a guide through writing studies, literary theory, socio-linguistics and rhetoric for a layperson stumbling through its dense conceptual jungle.

This dissertation is also certainly dedicated to my loved ones who have offered continued support. I wish to express love and gratitude to my family who have endured the academic expedition I have decided to journey. Your undying love and encouragement have provided me with a sense of virtue and value that imbues all of my work. Specifically, I wish to thank Elise, my wife, whose strength and passion has given me the necessary vitality to move forward; and whose image, like in picture frames, finds its way into all that I do. Lastly, I want to thank those that I have lost along the way. Your voices still haunt me and your love still inspires me.

ABSTRACT

THE STYLES OF CRIMINOLOGY:

WRITING AMONG THE STARS

Ethan Maxwell Higgins

May 12, 2018

This study investigates how criminological writing style is "a [more] complicated terrain" than we realize in criminology (Butler, 1990, p. xix). Data is drawn from interviews with forty of the one hundred most influential criminological writers (Walters, 2015) to explore perceptions of good writing in the field, namely in describing writing practices, norms and values. Thus, the findings of this study come in three chapters. The first two result chapters explore the terrain of writing in criminology by presenting perceptions of best practices and values of good writing. The third results chapter then examines these perceptions within a lens of writing studies and literary theory, which juxtaposes universal and socio-cultural perspectives of writing. By framing perceptions of best practices and values for good writing within a writing studies and literary theory framework, this study demonstrates that the way criminology perceives and discusses writing is different from the way writing works in criminology in reality. Last, this study provides conceptual implications that demonstrate how thinking about writing incorrectly forecloses potentially fruitful writing perspectives and practical implications that suggests how writing studies can benefit the future of the criminological enterprise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: STARS THAT ARE DISTURBINGLY IN MOTION

> I think that style is a complicated terrain, and not one that we unilaterally choose or control with the purposes we consciously intend…Certainly, one can practice styles, but the styles that become available to you are not entirely a matter of choice. Moreover, neither grammar nor style are politically neutral. Learning the rules that govern intelligible speech is an inculcation into normalized language, where the price of not conforming is the loss of intelligibility itself … (Butler, 1990, p. xix)

The flagship newsletter of the American Society of Criminology, *The Criminologist*, has recently spent a considerable amount of time discussing literate aspects of knowledge production that exist under the surface and which often go unnoticed. From doctoral students to the most accomplished scholars, articles in *The Criminologist* have ranged from discussions on writing practice in the field to waged debates over direct and indirect literate processes. For instance, a recent debate waged across the pages of *The Criminologist* focused on the use of journal outlet impact factors as a true means of assessing quality (Baker, 2015; Bursik, 2015; Delisi, 2015). Another article in the bulletin identified concerns regarding article length and makes a case for a style of writing that produces shorter and more concise journal articles (Rossmo, 2015). In another instance, criminologists lament the failures of criminology to effectively communicate scientific findings to the public and implore the scientific community to translate scientific words into "everyday" language (Beckley et al., 2017). Last, but not least, Paternoster and Brame (2015) implore the field that now is the time to bring a

critical eye to peer review specifically and the entire publishing process more generally. The discontent emanating from the conversational pages of *The Criminologist* relays the extent to which the field is woefully underprepared to understand and analyze the state of its own writing.

Criminology considerably lags behind other fields when it comes to evaluating and understanding its own unique writing terrain. In line with the applied linguistics literature, contemporary research has revealed considerable writing differences between the physical and social sciences, as well as large differences even within the social sciences (e.g. public health and criminology) themselves (Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2004; Sword, 2012). Literary theory and writing studies have been at the heart of questioning knowledge on writing practices and values. Contemporary views outside writing studies on technical social science writing often fall in line with the universal perspective on writing (Miller, 1979). In the universal perspective, writing sustains a material set of observable rules which are generationally passed down through training and represent the true way to correctly write. In turn, writing rules transcend disciplinary boundaries and good writing in one field is also good writing in another. This belief of writing can be read as a process of "writing up," where language is distinct from research and represents looking through a windowpane in order to see the truth (Miller, 1979). On the other hand, socio-cultural theories of writing have demonstrated that writing involves a constructivist dynamic in which an interaction exists between rules, philosophical assumptions, and disciplinary practices. In this view, writing is a process of being accepted into particular academic communities and constructing individual identity through in-text choices (i.e. of philosophical premises, of word choices, of grammar).

In line with socio-cultural theories on writing, this dissertation makes the argument that studying the most influential scholars is pertinent to understand the unique terrain of criminology's writing beliefs. This is the case for a couple reasons. First, in criminology, the most influential scholars have a considerable fingerprint on scholarship. Thus, this project focuses on interviewing the most influential scholars identified through quality and quantity metrics (Walters, 2015). The influence a scholar builds in the field is often based upon a body of research they have produced. To assess influence, statistical analyses are used to examine which individuals have contributed the largest volume of work and which has reached the largest readership. Additionally, the fingerprint of influential scholars is much larger than conceived by assessing publication influence. Influential scholars hold high-status positions in the field as reviewers and editors, socialize new generations of scholars into the field, and generously provide mentorship to colleagues. This array of status positions in the field locates the most influential scholars as a class of rule entrepreneurs and creators. That is, the most influential scholars are known as the most successful and skilled writers, and in turn, generations of new and upcoming scholars mimic writing styles, phrasing, word choices and grammar techniques. Between mimicry and peer review, the most influential writers in criminology have an indelible fingerprint on the production of writing rules, practices, and values.

Having gone through the graduate process I have first-hand experience dealing with the complex process of learning and being socialized into the rules of writing. There are many obstacles to learning how to write articles that are difficult, if not impossible, to articulate. A considerable part of learning how to write an article comes in discovering

which words the community allows and the phrases that are effective in communicating ideas and disciplinary principles. In effect, upcoming researchers often have great difficulty emulating writing practices of the community as they often feel manufactured and strange (Kamler & Thomson, 2014; Starke-Meyerring, 2011). In contrast, accomplished and influential writers often feel as though learning to write in a discipline is as simple as learning basic ground-rules; or that we may all go back to English class in high school and relearn the fundamentals of writing; or that classic books on writing can lead the way to good writing in criminology. Yet, becoming a successful publisher in criminology is not easy. The discord new scholars experience in learning disciplinary writing practices is well-documented (Kamler & Thomson, 2014; Starke-Meyerring, 2011). Tacit writing practices often govern what is "sayable" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 11), "what kinds of questions can and should be asked" (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 78), or "how much and what kind of subjectivity (e.g. 'I') writers can or should project in their writing" (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 78). There is also considerable evidence coming from writing studies which indicate that mentors lack the ability to articulate internalized writing practices necessary to succeed in the field (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). For those entering the field, the rules of "good writing" often feel distant and unattainable.

From a writing studies perspective, criminology is a unique site of exploration because it is a relatively new field with many beginnings and inter-disciplinary divisions. The origins of criminology can be traced to Beccaria and the Classical school, Lombroso and the Italian school, Sutherland and the Chicago school, and even to later stages, such as Becker with labeling theory and the critical approaches. Although criminology has

been repeatedly born again, it remains nonetheless a science fore-grounded by positivist methodological principles and has been cataloged by historians as being dominated by essentialist, Kantian and rationalist epistemological values. As Young (2011) has noted, the criminological sciences have been tasked with categorizing and unveiling universal truths behind criminality through methodological practices that aim to produce an "unmediated" lens to the knowledge of the natural world. Although these values may underpin criminological inquiry, empirical writing studies and literary theorists insist writing is a social and cultural enterprise that exceeds the neat restraints of positivist principles.

Thus, the implications of this project suggest that pervasive scientific principles in the field may cause criminologists to imagine or think about writing incorrectly. As such, new scholars may find themselves emulating the practices of the stars of the criminological academic community whose practices and beliefs about writing are in motion and dependent on context. This tension between how we think about writing and how we actually write is the underpinning of this investigation.

Thus, this study focuses on direct (i.e. individual values and writing practices) and indirect (i.e. surrounding practices and broad scientific values) literate practices as the *instrument* of criminological knowledge—directly adjacent to criminological knowledge itself. This is an under-theorized topic in criminology because writing is the center of producing and disseminating knowledge. Knowledge has a procedural cycle. Researchers follow rigorous methodologies and devise insightful conceptual arguments that become represented within a broad literature. These articles of research conjoin to form a working dialogue on a particular issue. Scholars write textbooks and research reports to

disseminate the working knowledge of crime and criminal justice issues to the public and practitioners. Despite the central function of writing to this process, for upcoming criminologists, writing training is a distant thought. Future criminologists are heavily trained in methodology and criminological content, and then, left to emulate the most productive and prestigious authors in the field. In this sense, writing may be the most important aspect of criminology (as it represents, contains and organizes all knowledge), and at the same time, the least trained and understood aspect of the field. To my best knowledge, there is not a criminology doctoral program with a formal process or requirement of teaching writing to upcoming scholars.[1] Thus, this study is an attempt to begin a scientific conversation on writing and to study the current state of writing in contemporary criminology.

In a theoretical sense, this study intends to investigate how criminological writers have style and how that style is "a [more] complicated terrain" than we realize (Butler, 1990, p. xix). This dissertation accomplishes two broad goals. By understanding "good writing" in the field, through perceptions on the best practices and the most pertinent values of good writing from influential scholars, the first goal can be understood as garnering a broad picture of the terrain of writing style in criminology. The second broad goal is to begin a discussion on writing by demonstrating through a writing studies theoretical lens that how we imagine writing often exists in conflict with how writing works in criminology in reality. The writing studies and literary theoretical framework used in this study juxtaposes universal and socio-cultural perspectives on how writing works. In turn, this project puts respondent interviews within a writing studies theoretical framework to demonstrate the complicated existence of style in criminological writing.

Chapter Outline

As demonstrated in the introduction in chapter 1, writing is central to the process of building and disseminating criminological knowledge to the academic and public community. Yet, learning literate practice is a tacit, and often confusing, process for upcoming scholars and graduate students. This dissertation provides a number of chapters in order to explore this topic. Chapter 2 examines the writing studies literature and composes a theoretical framework by juxtaposing universal and socio-cultural perspectives. The second chapter presents the concept of discourse communities to evaluate the criminological characteristics that influence writing in criminology. Chapter 3 investigates how criminological paradigms throughout history have altered criminological literacy. Thus, the third chapter explores criminology as a socio-cultural entity, in which the philosophical assumptions of the culture as well as the social interaction of publishing and productivity in the community influence literate practice. Chapter 4 overviews the methodological process used in this study by discussing the sample, data collection, and analysis. This chapter discusses the qualitative analytical research process as well as the grounded theory underpinning of the method.

Chapter 5 is the first chapter of the results of this dissertation. The first chapter of the results uses interviews to provide a typology for the most important and commonly discussed practices. This chapter presents the elements of the best practices in the field. Chapter 6 is the second chapter of the results of the dissertation. This chapter draws from interviews with scholars in order to provide a typology of the conceptual characteristics

needed for good writing in the field of criminology. Chapter 7 is the third and final chapter of the results of this dissertation. This chapter situates the elements of practices (chapter 4) and conceptual values (chapter 5) within the writing studies and literary theoretical framework. The theoretical framework, which juxtaposes the universal and socio-cultural perspective, is used to demonstrate that how we think about and discuss writing is different from how it exists in reality.

The eighth, and final, chapter of this dissertation is the conclusion which inquiries as to what are the implications of thinking about writing correctly or differently? Largely, this manuscript attempts to contribute to criminology is two primary ways. First, by painting a picture of the unique terrain of criminology's writing practices and values, criminology can join in scientifically analyzing the literate process—a pursuit that nearly every other social and physical science has undertaken to this point. Second, by situating our writing knowledge within a theoretical framework that juxtaposes the universal and socio-cultural perspectives, we can begin to take advantage of the manner in which writing studies has provided a language to discuss literate practices and norms. Thus, in this vein, this dissertation presents conceptual and practical implications for the field.

CHAPTER 2: WRITING STUDIES AND LITERACY PERSPCTIVES ON WRITING

The practical goal of this study is to investigate perceptions of literate practices and values in criminology. The theoretical goal of this study is to demonstrate that criminologists may be thinking incorrectly about the workings of literate practices and their role in scientific practices. In order to demonstrate these research questions, this study places scholar perceptions on literate practices within a writing studies theoretical framework[3]. In order to accomplish this goal, this study overviews differences in perspective in writing studies between what is termed here as the "universal" and the "socio-cultural" view on writing. The following section on writing studies provides terms and definitions of writing studies concepts in order to help introduce criminology to a scientific language designed to discuss literate practice.

The Universal Perspective

The universal perspective is a traditional way of thinking about literate practices in academic discourse. Miller (1979) identifies this type of writing as the "positivist" tradition of writing, where empirical positive principles have bled into the writing beliefs and practices of scientists. Likewise, Rorty (1978, p. 143) identifies this way of thinking about language as originating from Kantian rationalist principles, where writing is understood as being in "a vertical relationship of representation and what is represented" and where "scientific truth is the center of philosophical concern." These theorists demonstrate that positivist and rationalist principles have seeped into perspectives on

writing. Thus, the universal perspective is a way of thinking about what constitutes good writing in the sciences.

Epistemologically, the universal perspective is grounded in Saussure's structuralism view of writing and language. A structuralism perspective involves a few basic principles (Prior, 1998; 2003). First, a structuralism perspective of writing identifies an observational language that transcends the contexts and contingencies of the everyday. In other words, the language is not susceptible to change in context. Second, a structuralism perspective involves de-contextualization, in which words are trivialized as superficial phenomena. That is, words are seen as containing meaning rather than being constructed. Third, a structuralism perspective on writing involves government, or rather, a circle of rhetorical literate rules. Voloshinov (1973) poses the term "abstract objectivism" in order to critically summarize structural linguistics:

> This system leads us away from the living dynamic reality of language and its social functions….Underlying the theory of abstract objectivism are presuppositions of a rationalistic and mechanistic world outlook. These presuppositions are least capable of furnishing the grounds for a proper understanding of history—and language, after all, is a purely historical phenomenon (p. 83).

Historically this traditional perspective sprouted from classical rhetoric that identified that function of discourse as a vehicle to disseminate knowledge. Put differently, the classical school held that one finds knowledge and then distills it into communicable words. Classical rhetoric saw writing as simply "dressing up thought" rather than as the thought itself. Under the influence of Peter Ramus, classical rhetoric drifted from early Renaissance belletristic styles of elegance and poetry and became configured as a logical form of communication. Thus, classical rhetoric sought to remove

irrational appeals to rhetoric and adopt a plain, serious style of writing. In this form, rhetoric is relegated to a purely communicative method of disseminating information to external groups. Thus, the primary purpose of rhetoric is to dress up thought only so that other audiences may understand and extract the knowledge contained within the words (Reynolds, Bizzell & Herzberg, 2004).

Such a perspective on writing manifests in a few practical manners within an academic discourse. A universal writing practice manifests as a purely observational language (Miller, 1979). In this observational language, scientific writing must be empirically verifiable through commonsense and pure logic. Thus, a scientist uncovers knowledge and then paints a picture of phenomena using the most transparent language possible to find absolutely clear and untainted information—in which the message may never be misinterpreted. Beyond observation, objectivity is a central focus on technical, universal writing. Objectivity involves removing the self from writing, removing social interference and displaying self-evident material reality to readers. In this way, Miller (1979) metaphorically links this theory to a windowpane. That is, acting as a windowpane "language provides a view out onto the real world, a view which may be clear or obfuscated" (Miller, 1979, p. 611-12). Primarily a universal perspective on language suggests a core distinction between communicative language and rhetoric. In other words, a plain, straightforward and everyday language can effectively transmit scientific messages and is free and clear from social, cultural or constructed elements of aesthetic or subjective rhetoric.

In this view writing is more a technical and practical endeavor than humanist. In other words, writing practice contains a number of rules that upcoming scholars may

learn, internalize and employ themselves. In turn, scientific writing and communication are considered to be separable from technical and non-technical language. There are some words worth using and topics worth studying, and then, there are others that fall outside of the scope of scientific inquiry. Thus, when language is considered a windowpane, language is devised as being wholly separable from the content it describes. Despite lacking a metric or measure by which one my divine technical from non-technical words, a universal view suggests that words may only muddy the clear waters through jargon or rhetoric. In this sense, all of writing practice becomes a procedure of discovering the least murky way to disseminate scientific findings.

In this project, this traditional view of social science writing has been adopted as the universal perspective. This study theoretically extends on the windowpane theory of Miller and way of thinking on language by Rorty, by merging these perspectives with Lamont's (2002; 2009) seminal body of research. Lamont's (2009) work on symbolic boundaries and evaluating good writing differentially across academic cultures seems particularly pertinent here. Lamont (2009) has cataloged a number of modalities by which groups divine social and symbolic boundaries. Among these modes, Lamont (2009, p.177) discusses the process by which scientific communities construct symbolic boundaries through rhetorical means:

> Social boundaries prompts researchers to develop a relational and systemic (often ecological) perspective on knowledge production sensitive to historical processes and symbolic strategies in defining the content and institutional contours of professional and scientific activity.

In contrast, the universal perspective undermines the rhetorical notion of symbolic boundaries, and instead, suggests that the technical rules of good, scientific writing travel

across them unaltered. Thus, the merged notion that windowpane writing travels insists that a purely technical and observational language is achievable by learning a set of technical skills and rules, like gathering tools for a tool-belt, where writing skill is limited to employing the effective tools in the correct situation and where writing socialization involves building up a set of technical tools that communicate clearly in all communities.

The Socio-Cultural Perspective

A socio-cultural perspective provides an academic counter-narrative to the pervasive philosophical view of social science writing as a universal windowpane. Indeed, socio-cultural theories of writing have been widely used to investigate this complexity in writing studies scholarship.[2] As a point of contrast to the universal, a socio-cultural perspective identifies that writing practices and values are negotiated within a community of authors, that positivists principles are not fully achievable in subjective writing practices, and that one cannot get between scientific words and concepts.

Underlying socio-cultural theories on writing is the presupposition that "grammars are never neutral" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 89). In contrast to the universal perspective, Threadgold (1997) has argued, there is "nothing scientific or absolute about a grammar; it is just a set of categories which we use to impose structure and meaning on language" (Threadgold 1997; In Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 89). While narratives are the composition of a pattern of choices, the narratives we choose from are limited by structures (Fleetwood, 2016). Likewise, writing is a social enterprise where there is a dynamic intersection of individual decision-making inside a disciplinary or epistemic lexicon. As Casanave (2002) indicates, academic writing is conceptualized as "writing games" to denote the extent to which different communities of writers have

alternative rules and values. Thus, new members of an academic community are socialized into unique practices and rules and must make effective choices in using the accepted vernacular and style to be accepted.

Academic discourse is a social and cultural interaction between individuals that share similar goals and ideologies. Scholars of writing and discourse studies have teased out a three-tier approach to understanding socio-cultural discourses in the academic community, consisting of text, disciplinary practices and sociocultural practices (Fairclough, 1992; Thomson & Kamler, 2016). For Fairclough (1992) the text is represented by actual spoken or written language. Literate practice involves conventional disciplinary practices (i.e. APA) and sociocultural practice considers scholarly and national conventions (i.e. empiricism). Such a model is useful because it represents that written and spoken language is co-dependent on its surrounding contexts. In their research, applying the model to doctoral students, Kamler and Thomson (2014) marginally depart from Fairclough's (1992) description of the tiers. For instance, Kamler and Thomson (2014) note that discourse practices (or mediating practices) consist of disciplinary interactions and judgments whereas sociocultural practices involve the "histories, conventions and expectations" of the discourse community (p. 23).

The three-tiers of writing, represented by Fairclough (1992), and Kamler and Thomson (2014), identify the characteristics of academic communities that share common discourses, practices, and goals that guide their means of communication. These constructions of writing (such as the standard IMRAD structure: introduction, methods, results, discussion) are embodied at an individual level in which a scholar must conform to writing practices at larger levels, such as disciplinary and socio-cultural

practices. In other words, academic discourse communities limit the discursive ways a scholar can write their research and "limit, frame and form…what is sayable—what it is possible to speak and write about" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 11). Theories of writing demonstrate that writing research is a value-based, social and cultural process based on underlying practices and processes of power that are internalized by community members. Such practices of power within writing are distributed among all three domains of Fairclough's (1992) model of discourse: text, disciplinary practices, and socio-cultural context.

The socio-cultural perspective on writing styles have been studied across writing studies and fields that study literate practices (Lamont, 2009; Olinger, 2014, 2016; Schaefer, 2015; Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006). Among these, scholars have investigated the way in which evaluative cultures differ across disciplinary boundaries (Lamont, 2009). In relation to the peer review process, Lamont (2009) seminally investigated how different disciplinary cultures had differing definitions on what counts as good science writing. Likewise, researchers have explored social science writing as a dynamic space, in which an author can cater to disciplinary conventions while also demonstrating self-expression (Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006). In this sense, Thaiss and Zawacki (2006) examined how self-expression in science writing can manifest across disciplines. Additionally, researchers have challenged the notion that disciplines have absolute writing style and instead suggest that styles are tied to personal histories and individually embodied (Olinger, 2014). The current theoretical model from writing studies—which juxtaposes the universal and sociocultural—is grounded within these previous studies across writing studies.

Discourse communities. When we consider socio-cultural theories of writing socialization and discourse—such as Fairclough's (1992) model of discourse—we recognize that these models identify writing as constructed practices based upon values and not objective vehicles of explaining material phenomena. Put another way, Fairclough's (1992) model demonstrates that text exists in a relationship with disciplinary practices and socio-cultural context. Writing practices that sprout from these contexts and develop as common practices and conventions for a field are known as discourse communities. Discourse communities serve as an appropriate heuristic tool to understand a counter-position of the universal perspective. As Swales (2016) has noted, "a discourse community is a group of people who share a set of discourses, understood as basic values and assumptions, and ways of communicating about their goals" (p. 9). Thus, if a discipline or field acts as a discourse community with shared values and meanings attributed to writing then these groups can have different understandings of social science writing.

Discourse communities are conjoined by a structured set of rules where writing is subject to shared grammar and values (Bizzell, 1982, Porter, 1986; Swales, 2016). Bakhtin's (1981) concept of "heteroglossia" underpins the manifestation of a discourse community: a combination of multiple voices to denote that writers often construct research by learning phrases and writing techniques from other scholars. An important aspect of maintaining membership within a discourse community includes using agreed upon terminologies—such as consensus words and phrases to describe concepts—to discuss scientific phenomena or approach particular areas of scientific inquiry. Whereas criminology may have agreed upon terminologies to discuss phenomena, other fields may

have their own distinct vernacular. Thus, a discourse community shares both a particular set of assumptions about knowledge and also "what objects are appropriate for examination and discussion, what operating functions are performed on those objects, what constitutes 'evidence' and 'validity,' and what formal conventions are followed" (Porter, 1986, p. 39).

Such philosophical assumptions provide definitions as to what questions are valid and which answers are allowed to be found. That is, words powerfully construct what is allowed to be scientific and formulate lenses that produce lines of academic visibility. These lines are enforced through publication, as the writer in the discourse community must meet particular philosophical standards in order to be heard. If the writer fails to follow these standards they risk the community casting them out as non-scientific, non-scholarly or losing membership. As Leitch (1983, p. 145) notes:

> …a speaker must be 'qualified' to talk; he has to belong to a community of scholarship; and he is required to possess a prescribed body of knowledge (doctrine)… [This system] operates to constrain discourse; it establishes limits and regularities… who may speak, what may be spoken, and how it is to be said; in addition [rules] prescribe what is true and false, what is reasonable and what is foolish, and what is meant and what not. Finally, they work to deny the material existence of discourse itself.

Of course, beyond meeting philosophical assumptions, the writer must adhere to regulations within a discourse community. It is not only broad philosophical paradigms (i.e. objectivity) and disciplinary characteristics (i.e. APA, MLA, etc.) that must be met, but individual text choices must also be seen to conform to the community. Writing procedures demonstrate a particular level of meticulousness in the writing of the manuscript and follow the historical traditions and conventions that are set:

> A text is 'acceptable' within a forum only insofar as it reflects the community episteme (to use Foucault's term)…it must follow certain formatting conventions; it must have the expected social science sections (i.e., review of literature, methods, results, discussion), and it must use the journal's version of APA documentation;… it must demonstrate (or at least claim) that it contributes knowledge to the field; it must demonstrate familiarity with the work of previous researchers in the field, it must use a scientific method in analyzing its results, it must adhere to standards determining degrees of accuracy (Porter, 1986, p. 39).

Academic discourses indicate a process of interaction that occurs between writer and community, where writing rules, phrasing, structuring and words choices are learned. Many of these conventions and rules are not explicit, but rather exist as "silential relations" (Becker, 1995; Swales, 2016). Silential relations exist "whereby there is a sense of things that do not need to be said or to be spelt out" (Swales, 2016, p. 16). These silent relations—consisting of rules about objectivity, word choices, grammar, and organizational guidelines and so on—transfer information about writing in the field as new scholars are socialized into the discourse community. Thus, academic discourse entails "a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation, and stance-taking" (Duff, 2010, p. 170).

Research on discourse communities represents that writing practices and values are by-products of a social and cultural enterprise. In contrast to the universal, then, what is considered good writing alter across discourse communities? In this sense, universal concepts such as "observational," "objective" and "technical" are differentially negotiated between members of the discourse community.

Differences in discourse communities. Whereas the universal perspective identifies good writing as unified, or a language which is the same across all boundaries,

discourse communities demonstrate that these practices and values can be different between academic communities (i.e. criminology versus writing studies for instance). Put another way, the universal perspective often identifies writing as having a homogenous nature, where technical skills are the same in all communities. Writing studies research on discourse communities provide a counter-position for thinking about writing instead as underpinned by a heterogeneous nature, wherein discourse communities have distinct practices or values (Porter, 1986). However, recent writing studies literature has critiqued this notion of discourse communities as too homogenous in itself, and instead, recent research has demonstrated that heterogeneity in writing practice and value even exists within single discourse communities. That is, sub-sectors of an individual field are likely to differentially negotiate their own expected practices and values (Prior, 1998). Thus, literary theorists and writing studies research have identified the heterogeneous nature of discourse communities and how they may contrast other discourse communities.

Discourse community values can manifest in various ways depending on the academic community. At times, levels of the text exist in contradiction to one another (i.e. tension between text, disciplinary practices, and philosophical assumptions). For example, many disciplines discourage the use of personal pronouns in scholarly writing as a mark of informality that should only be used outside scholarly publications. Personal pronouns contrast the universal perspective notion of objectivity and provide an open door for subjectivity, preference and aesthetic value. Instead, students are often taught that pronouns, such as "I" or "we," should be forfeit for phrasing that removes the researcher from the writing process (Sword, 2012). Instead of personal pronouns, phrasing includes a level of depersonalization by transferring the responsibility to the

paper itself (e.g. “this paper will show”) or to a larger group behind the writing and research process (e.g. “the authors demonstrate”). In other cases, the personal pronoun “we” supplants the pronoun “I” where the addition of persons adds to the legitimacy of claims in the research. The removal of pronouns demonstrates an aesthetic practice that gives scientific research a more objective feeling. This automatic preoccupation with objectivity, which is evident of a universal paradigm, underlies much of writing in the criminological sciences (Young, 2011).

Ironically, one would think that the hard sciences would be more interested in maintaining the objective science aesthetic in research writing, and in turn, commonsense judgments would indicate that social science would be more attuned to using personal pronouns. However, research has shown that the preoccupation with pronoun usage is more prevalent in social sciences than the hard sciences; which demonstrates that writing rules are often cultural phenomena rather than steadfast universal rules of good writing. As Sword (2012) has noted, “we end up with the intriguing paradox that the evolutionary biologists in my data sample, who write mostly about plants and animals, use personal pronouns in every one of the fifty articles I surveyed (100 percent), while the higher education researchers, who write most about human beings, use I or we only about half the time (54 percent)” (p. 39). Sword (2012) goes on to note that “only 40 percent of the historians in my sample employ I or the personal we, in contrast to 92 percent of philosophers and 98 percent of the literary scholars” (p. 39). As Young (2011) has argued, this could be because newer social sciences are still trying to gain acceptance as “real” science in the eyes of society by mobilizing language in manuscripts that feels more scientific. Obviously, this criticism fails to make sense with history—that is as old

as history itself—but resonates with new disciplines such as criminology that is regularly trying to establish scientific legitimacy. Nonetheless, a communal attempt to establish legitimacy by using particular writing techniques falls in line with a socio-cultural perspective where writing practices are negotiated among members and aligned with cultural assumptions.

Even more ironically, Sword (2012) notes that social scientists have discourse conventions that can often collide into one another paradoxically. For instance, despite the long-standing axiom that social scientists should avoid the use of personal pronouns, the APA publication manual has "advocated the use of personal pronouns since 1974" (p. 39). In this sense, many of the practices, conventions, and rules that characterize a discourse community are put forth for aesthetic reasons where the community is constructing a collective legitimacy through writing. This exists in stark contrast to the common universal notion of scholarly writing to construct absolute truths through scientific narratives—that is, some words and phrases organically or intrinsically contain more scientific validity than others. These contradictions make evident the heterogeneous nature of discourse community practices where, interestingly, a community employs a wide range of negotiated discourse practices that counteract and conflict with or unravel others. In this example put forth by Sword, disciplinary and discourse conventions conflict within the same field and challenge universal notions of absolute clarity.

In line with imagining criminological writing as an academic community—where writing choices are indicative of a collective discourse identity—understandings of clarity are relative to the community's assumptions. For instance, in criminology introductory texts (Kraska & Neuman, 2012) experienced scholars indicate scientific writing should

maintain a high level of clarity in order to produce easily consumable science for the community. However, definitions of what is clear greatly differ depending on the values of a discourse community. For example, Foucault, perhaps one of the most prominent post-structural theorists, is noted by Sword (2012) as exemplifying clear jargon-free writing: "Where have all those self-proclaimed Foucauldians picked up their love of jargon? Certainly not from Foucault himself, whose influential writings on discipline, power, sexuality, and other weighty matters are rhythmically compelling, relentlessly concrete, and almost entirely jargon-free" (p. 119). Yet, others often view Foucault, and similar scholars, amusingly and elect to avoid their insights on the criminal justice institution while using their writings as an example of bad research or technical writing. When dealing with critical theorists, many echo the sentiments of Chomsky:

> If something can be said simply, say it simply, so that the carpenter next door can understand you. Anything that is at all well understood about human affairs is pretty simple. I find Foucault really interesting but I remain skeptical of his mode of expression. I find that I have to decode him, and after I have decoded him, maybe I'm missing something. I don't get the significance of what I am left with. I have never effectively understood what he was talking about. I mean, when I try to take the big words he uses and put them into words that I can understand and use, it is difficult for me to accomplish this task. It all strikes me as overly convoluted and very abstract. But what happens when you try to skip down to real cases? The trouble with Foucault, and with this certain kind of theory, arises when it tries to come down to earth. Really, nobody was able to explain to me the importance of his work (Antosofia, 2003).

In these situations, literate practices and values in the social sciences are evidently disparate across disciplines and fields. For example, clarity in one field may be negotiated differently than in another field. These tensions exist in writing practices as

well; such as the way restrictions on the use of pronouns are contradicted by APA guides that encourage authors to use them.

These instances replete in the literature demonstrate complicated ways that different discourse communities can oppose one another in their perceptions of good writing. Perhaps more egregiously, in some of these cases, discourse communities are seen to oppose themselves at different levels of the text. As described earlier, disciplinary conventions may oppose or counteract broader scientific conventions within a single discourse community. These findings in the literature offer a considerable contest to a universal perspective on writing.

Socialization into the discourse community. A common underlying notion of the universal perspective is that writing in scientific communities is a matter of picking up technical writing skills. Thus, like a tool belt, students may learn basic syntactical and grammatical fundamentals in grade school and bring those tools with them to criminology. If this is the case, there is not all that much to learn or teach about writing in criminology. Yet, research in writing studies and applied linguistics research on graduate student and upcoming scholar experiences with writing has documented extreme frustration and struggle (Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Casanave & Li, 2008; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Pratt, 2014; Starke-Meyerring, 2011).

Practices of the field are often historically devised and solidified over generations. Thus, for new students, the practices of the field, the correct vernacular and the more explicit publishing rules often seem to be so normalized and universal that writing seems to consist of a simple process of learning the rules of the game. This notion of reproducing writing rules heavily conflicts with the notion of author text agency, where

the individual has the ability to convey a particular stance and identity based on decisions made throughout the text (Hyland, 1999). From a social-cultural perspective, writing in academic communities is about aligning one's language with a community in order to qualify one's self as a legitimate speaker. In turn, an upcoming scholar can choose which communities of writing they wish to align with and employ those particularly negotiated practices. Thus, new scholars often struggle to navigate the line between "identity-work" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014) and the tacit rules of the field. This double-sided challenge of knowing tacit rules and finding identity in the text constructs a considerable struggle for new scholars in writing.

In contrast to a universal perspective that suggests learning to write is as simple as learning basics in grade school, a socio-cultural view of writing understands that learning constructed practices and values happens through a socialization process. Upcoming scholars may learn the unique writing practices and values of the field through two forms of socialization: implicit and explicit. Although academic training typically offers very little formal writing instruction, graduate students typically find informal instruction from mentors (Pare, 2011). Thus, writing with mentors or maintaining a writing dialogue (where the mentor provides commentary on written work) is an explicit form of socialization. As Starke-Meyerring (2011) notes: "writers learn to make those decisions through their gradual and ideally mentored participation in the discursive practices of their research culture" (p. 81). For many graduate students, learning to write the text is often left up to the teaching effectiveness of the mentor. Ironically, an absence of formal training means that any provided mentor advice on writing often lacks effectively articulated instruction. This leaves graduate students unclear on how to perform

foundational tasks, such as the well-known difficulties in writing a literature review (Denny & Tewksbury, 2013; Kamler & Thomson, 2006). This transfer of the rules and practices to students is a kind of language socialization, where "learners gain knowledge of language and an ability to participate in new discourse communities by using language appropriately, they gain various other kinds of information or cultural knowledge about ideologies, identities, or subjectivities, affective orientations, linguistic and nonlinguistic content (history, mathematics) and practices valued by the community" (Ochs, 1986; In Duff, 2010, p. 173). Through interaction with mentors, peers and the community, the language and rules of the discourse community are internalized, which provides new scholars with philosophical worldviews, notions of community and discourse practices, and the ability to construct a text.

There is also an implicit aspect by which new scholars are socialized into writing styles within a discourse community. The implicit manner of socialization exists any time a scholar is interacting with the field. Hence, whenever a scholar reads academic literature, speaks with other discourse community members or writes their own text they are in conversation with a collective field of community members. This can be explained, in part, through Kristeva's "intertextuality" (Irwin, 2004) – similar to Bakhtins's "heteroglossia" – and is important in understanding the complex relationship between a new scholar and the community. Intertextuality notes that a particular text in a field sustains meaning through the interactional relationship with other texts in the discourse community; or, as Bazerman (2004) notes, how a statement is related to "that sea of words…how it uses those words, how it positions itself in respect to those other words" (p. 84). A text can be defined through the discourses it weaves into itself. In this way, the

text is a relational and fluid object and not a fixed or static vehicle for disseminating knowledge. These philosophical, structural and textual elements are learned and reproduced by the individual scholar. Derrida (1976) calls this process "traces," where text and vernacular may be followed back to the discourses from which they have been called forth. Following Derrida's concept of traces, one could say that criminology is a type of writing that finds meaning through difference in relation to a history of other texts by embodying particular philosophical assumptions about the world that identify around it symbolic boundaries and define it as a discourse community distinct from other academic fields. Likewise, individual authors within criminology are bombarded with an array of fragmented implicit and explicit rules, that appear hazy or fuzzy, that shift depending on one's socialization experience and community.

Identity-work and individual text choice. Graduate and doctoral student confusion on writing is a well-documented event where students often note that mentors and other community members lack the ability to effectively communicate what problems exist and how to rectify them (Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Pare, 2011). If writing is a socio-cultural enterprise and yet mentors and students are conditioned to think of writing from a universal point of view, then student frustration on learning and mentor articulation make considerable sense.

While students often bring some form of anxiety with them through a desire for succeeding in the field as a publishing author, these anxieties are also compounded through interactions with accomplished community members that seem to simply know but not able to articulate important aspects of writing. The discord between the ability to write in the discourse community and the inability to articulate discourse practices is

understood as the problem of "automaticity." As Pare (2011, p. 62) notes, "as we become more and more expert at performing certain actions, we may have less and less ability to articulate the knowledge that allows us to act." This interaction demonstrates an implicit rejection – whereby the inability of the successful member to communicate problems and remedies is indicative of the student's inability to glean an obvious and observable universal truth about writing (i.e. the realities of the universal perspective). That is to say, if the mentor cannot describe the issue, it is because the issue is so basic and obvious that the student should simply already know.

These interactions inform new scholars on how "their histories and aspirations are viewed and by how they are positioned—by themselves, by others, and by their institutions—as capable (or incapable), as worthy, legitimate, showing potential for fuller participation or membership (or not), as insiders (or outsiders), and so on" (Duff, 2010, p. 176). These interactions with writing gatekeepers represent a rejection of personal creativity outside of the prevailing structure of writing, where students must learn to follow homogenous and traditional rules (Starke-Meyerring, 2011). Yet, at the same time, writing is a creative pursuit where new scholars can formulate identities through text choices and writing practices that often escape the hermetically structured endeavor of writing scientifically (Ivanic, 1998). For new scholars and graduate students, the struggle to find a voice can be linked to the complicated relationship between the structured process, the gatekeepers of writing and the ability to write one's self into the text. Thus, agency takes place in-between the rejecting power of the social structure (i.e. writing customs, mentors as gatekeepers, publishing requirements) and the borrowing ability of the individual scholar.

These frustrations challenge the universal perspective by indicating that writing rules are not commonsense but constructed, and that accomplished authors embody these socio-cultural principles through experience but espouse teachings from a universal imaginary on writing. These concepts of student frustration and how students learn by connecting their histories with moving goals of discourse communities challenge a broad notion of universal homogeneity. In other words, within a universal perspective, there is not all that much to writing. Good writing is completely homogenous as great writers have a similar set of technical tools with appropriate and inappropriate uses. However, the concept of discourse communities challenges this by insisting that practices and technical tools are constructed between discourse communities.

Yet, even the concept of discourse communities can be considered overly homogenous as it fails to capture the unique experiences of individual authors. The concepts of intertextuality and traces indicate that writing is often not a simple, linear, or unidirectional event but develops in dialogue with a discourse community and meaning is both borrowed by the individual and fluid in the community. Thus, from a socio-cultural perspective we can see that writing is a complicated heterogeneous, yet relational, set of concepts where an individual is always connecting their personal experiences to the values of shifting and moving discourse communities.

In this sense, Rorty (1978, p. 143) offers a second way to think about language, in which it is imagined "horizontally…as the culminating reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation." Thus, it may be fruitful to consider individual writing style as a multiplicity rather than as adopting homogenous, singular styles, wherein writing style is not simply prescribed by universal

skills, disciplinary conventions, or sub-sector philosophies, but merged with individual author histories. In this reimagining of how writing exists, we can—as Rorty instructs—reframe our writing imaginary as horizontal as opposed to vertical. This re-conceptualization invites us to re-imagine writing as a cultural phenomenon—or one among many possible discourses—instead of a singular scientific discourse. This re-imagining of how writing works present a counter-narrative to the way in which criminology often discusses writing in the field.

CHAPTER 3: WRITING, PHILOSOPHY AND STYLE IN CRIMINOLOGY

In the previous section, a division in writing studies literary theoretical perspectives were posed between the universal and socio-cultural views. If we can imagine contemporary criminological discourse as a cultural phenomenon in contrast to a universal view, then it is important to situate it historically. In turn, understanding the paradigmatic underpinnings of different time periods and inter-disciplinary factions can demonstrate the division between how writing exists and how we think about it and the ways that different communities facilitate alternative styles of writing.

Writing in criminology is bolstered by a unique history of development, where the field is spread among multiple extremes—positivism and sociological origins, knowledge-building and socially-applied functions, quantitative, qualitative and theoretical works. As a field much newer than others, the current project holds criminology as a unique site in which writing philosophies and practices may be investigated. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that philosophy and writing cannot be disentangled from one another, and further, that paradigmatic underpinnings of a field influence writing style, practices, and values.

Differences in Writing Style in Criminological History

The criminological enterprise can be traced to a very particular start in the sciences which influenced writing style in the community. Between Lombroso—who is heralded as the "father of criminology" and published his first seminal text in 1876—and then in the 1920s and 1930s when criminology became a central focus endemic within

Western civilizations, the science of criminology was purported to be of great utility in dealing with crime, criminality and establishing legitimacy in the modern criminal justice penal institution. According to Garland (1985; 1992), the rise of criminology largely consisted of three distinct components: psychiatry, statistics, and social application.

As early as 1764, Beccaria (and other rationalist philosophers) had created a criminological revolution through enlightenment philosophy. They asserted that an analysis of criminal action departs from its spiritual and theological origins and should find its way into reasonable explanations. This newfound philosophy, known as the classical school, adopted cornerstone principles of modern criminology. These involved ideas such as the social contract, a presumption of innocence, a defined taxonomy of offenses and punishments, and that punishment should correspond with the severity of the crime (Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 2015). These components were underpinned by a philosophical revolution that held individuals as rational beings with free will and as guided by hedonistic principles. The rational philosophical revolution, as part of the philosophical enlightenment, set the stage for the study of modern criminology, effectively merging rational understandings of crime with modern empiricism (i.e. things are knowable through observable facts).

Based on the rationality and empiricism found in the philosophical revolution of the classical school, in the 19th century, the positivist school wished to study the criminal to understand the origins and construction of the criminal being. For positivists, who wished to study the individual, the need for tangible data and empirical facts became central to their task (Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 2015). While Lombroso believed in the need for rational and empirical data in the discovery of the criminal origin and workings, his

study was in tension with classical assertions that the criminal adhered to calculating and hedonistic principles of free will. Instead, Lombroso saw criminality as deterministic biological mutations where free will was overcome by genetic predispositions and psychiatric factors (Lombroso, Gibson & Rafter, 2006; Rafter, 2005a; 2005b). Lombroso imagined criminality as evolving as a form of mutation, atavism, and degeneracy. Within the inflicted lines of criminal beings, physical characteristics manifested that represented the mutated inner-selves. These physical mutations included long arms and legs, sloping foreheads, twisted noses and other peculiar aesthetic qualities. This notion of evolutionary science closely resembled the physical sciences of the time. Lombroso's works followed and closely resembled the works of Charles Darwin, such as *The Descent of Man* and *The Origin of Species*.

The biological positivism paradigm was followed by other Italian school academics. For example, Enrico Ferri emphasized Lombroso's undermining of free will in individual criminality. Ferri expanded Lombroso's use of biological positivism to include other external factors involving "physical factors (e.g. race, geography, temperature), individual factors (age, gender, psychological variables), and social factors (e.g. population, religion, culture)" (Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 2015,, p. 23). Similarly, Raffaele Garofalo contributed to the biological positivism by reframing criminality as a natural crime. Like Lombroso, Garofalo's theoretical framing of criminality closely resembled Darwin's science, imputing factors of survival of the fittest and social Darwinism. As a "natural crime," society is seen as a natural body by which crimes become offenses against nature. Like a naturally evolving body then, society must

destroy or eliminate the individuals counter to its progression. By eliminating criminals, Garofalo believed society could progress.

While much of the Italian school's seminal discoveries came into existence at the end of the 19th century, their influence began to be felt in the United States in the early 20th century. Most centrally, the positivist traditions and the investigation of the criminal being were greatly influenced by Hooton. Heavily influenced by Lombroso's work, Hooton (1939) published studies that demonstrated how criminals are inferior through physical aspects of their body. Following the Italian school, Hooton's work revolved around linking these inferior physical aspects to the mental instability and atavism he believed to be inherent in criminal beings. A friend of Hooton, William Sheldon studied delinquent males to illuminate the linkage between physical qualities and mental inferiority. Sheldon eventually concluded that since physical aspects of juveniles were often similar to their parents, that mental inferiority and criminality is an inherited genetic trait passed down through generations. Likewise, Glueck and Glueck (1950) famously investigated the linkage between physical aspects and mental inferiority through a comparative study of delinquent and non-delinquent males.

For the most part, this type of biological positivism has been denounced in modern criminological sciences. While many of Lombroso's suggestions on criminality are considered unfashionable today, he is considered the "father of criminology" and scientific techniques—such as phrenology-type practices—and he set the stage for criminological analysis of "born criminals" (Lombroso, Gibson, & Rafter, 2006; Rafter, 2005a; 2005b). The positivist-based Italian science benefitted the future of modern criminology in multiple ways. For instance, the Italian school effectively refocused

criminology as a study of the individual rather than purely the state. The classical school of criminology often saw crime studies as only an extension of state-legal matters—such as punishment (Cohen, 1988; Matza, 1967; 1987). Additionally, Lombroso packaged the study of crime with the gathering of social science knowledge that is different from the classical school that saw crime as a metaphysical or moralist issue (Rafter, 2005b).

However, in parallel to the biological positivism founded by Lombroso and the positivist school, a psychiatric positivism developed with great popularity in the United States. The growth of psychiatric positivism centered on psychoanalysis and personality traits. Freud's (1920) vision of psychoanalytic analysis became valuable when considered in a positivist framing. In Freud's view, crime was a representation of oft subconscious, inner conflict. Thus, unconscious desires (e.g. the id) were in conflict with conscious notions of morality and sociality in the modern world (e.g. the ego). This inner conflict spurred unknown and unrecognized motivations and purposes to commit criminal action and deviance. Psychoanalytic analysis likewise has fallen out of academic favor, yet investigations into mental faculty and the relation to criminality have spurred an investigation of personality traits that correlate with criminality. The use of personality traits—such as feeblemindedness, insanity, stupidity, aggressiveness, and hyperactivity—to explain the mental faculties predisposed towards criminal action became largely widespread as a means of studying crime in the United States.

These developments of positivism and psychiatry became widespread in criminology through the methodology of quantitative methods (Garland, 1992; Young, 2011). Early positivists had attempted to categorize distinct groupings of the population based upon physical and biological attributes through physical observations. However,

with modern advances in statistical procedure and knowledge, quantitative data became central to a scientific process of organizing causal laws and categorizations of biological or mental criminality. These three original components of criminology were couched in modern enlightenment assumptions heralded by the classical school, such as rationality, reason or taxonomy. As Garland notes:

> The development of psychiatry and statistics in the nineteenth century, and later the rise of psychology and social work, created professionals with new claims to authority in the criminal justice field, and the development of a criminological approach often extended the powers and jurisdiction of one professional group at the expense of another. On the other hand, the (partial) 'scientization' of criminal justice could only occur to the extent that it was allowed to do so by the established participants – lawyers, judges, penal authorities, even offenders themselves – and one should perhaps explore whether the new 'criminological' approach was perceived as a means of dealing with problems and conflicts in a manner which was beneficial to these participants as well as to the criminological professionals themselves" (Garland, 1992, p. 418).

Criminological Philosophies and Writing Styles

It is commonly asserted that such an origin of the field—positivist empirical principles of quantitative methods and social control—produced a type of knowledge construction in modern criminology, including a particular type of language to discuss the criminological sciences (Foucault, 1995; Garland, 1985; Mills, 1959; Young, 2011). In a similar way to Foucault's study of knowledge and discourse, a few scholars have investigated the extent to which the scientific language of criminology is simply one possible cultural language among many. Countering the notion that scientific language provides "an unmediated connection to reality" (Young, 2011), the language of science is

seen as consisting of co-constructed narratives that are interconnected with sociality, culture, politics and aesthetic principles. Therein scientific languages and ways of writing science are paradigmatic in themselves and fail to escape or exist outside the current framing of knowledge in the field.

For example, the early writings of Lombroso heavily contrast with contemporary writing styles in criminology—particularly in the manner that scientific publications are "storied." For instance, Rafter and Ystehede's (2010) analysis of Lombroso's early criminological style and particular narrative techniques examined the deep connection between science and gothic storytelling. Rafter and Ystehede (2010) demonstrate how the gothic styling of Lombroso's writing – "skulls and brains, anatomical and psychological anomalies, cruelty and savagery, deviant sexuality, insane criminals, epileptic criminals, hysterical criminals" (p. 274) – influences and crystallizes representations of the offender. Lombroso was able to strike fear into the hearts of readers by painting criminality as pathologically transmogrifying people into "freaks of nature, tainted families, moral insanity, and unnatural acts" (Rafter & Ystehede, 2010, p. 274). Rafter and Ystehede (2010) go on to conclude, "Paradoxically, Lombroso was scientific and gothic at the same time. How are we to explain this paradox? Perhaps, it can be understood by thinking of the gothic as not the antithesis of enlightenment rationality, but its double, its flipside, its dark underbelly" (p. 277). Rafter and Ystehede (2010) suggest that a purely biological and positivist language fits neatly within the words of a rationalized style of horror and danger, that even in Lombroso's scientism his writing of observational science is still couched within a preferential literary aesthetic of Gothicism. Indeed, the unnatural images of "corpses" and "vampires" created an alluring story-

telling device with the normal/abnormal biological underpinnings of the contemporary science, such as phrenology, the Italian school and Lombroso's criminological canon (Lombroso, Gibson & Rafter, 2006; Rafter, 2005a). In effect, the presumptions contained in the scientific paradigm of the time informed the manner by which the narrative was styled, packaged and disseminated.

Likewise, Mohamed and Fritzvold (2010) briefly mention a styling technique and story-device of contemporary criminological narratives:

> Academic research literature often reads like a classic detective story in the sense that, in the end and in most cases, the hero gets his or her man or woman. In this particular metaphor, the hero is the researcher and more often than not and with only minor surprises the research literature suggests that scholars find what they set out to look for. To be sure, much of the literature indicates some relatively insignificant unexpected turns along the way. But, at the end of the day, the hero prevails as the research narrative tends to validate the speculation that initially launched the project (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2010, p. 63).

These reflections on criminological writing provide historical counter-positions for the way that values in the criminological social structure influenced actual narratives and writing practices. These plot devices take a great deal for granted in their presentation of truth and reality. For Lombroso, the gothic presentation of criminological science sacrifices the social imprint of the external world on individuals to emphasize the monster within, drawing from timely Gothic storytelling aesthetics. For contemporary criminology, the classic detective story device parallels Comtean experimental methodology, which values procedural stages as the practice of "good science," despite its rare use in the social sciences. This limits the nature of failure and choice that is commonplace in the course of research and the progression by which science procedures

take place. These differential story devices and narratives are indicative of distinct styles of producing criminological research—one of a historical style and the other a contemporary style. Each appears to value different forms of narrative technique, such as what is made clear and what is hidden. As is the case in all text—technical or creative—writing is framed, packaged and valued as to what is hidden and what is divulged. Text can never be fully transparent and choices are always necessary to determine what meaning is transferred to the reader.

More so, these different story-devices and narrative values implicate the trend of a growth of writing styles in criminology that has exploded in the 20th century:

> There appears, for example, to have been a series of transformations in the basic style of criminological inquiry since the end of the nineteenth century, or perhaps a multiplication of styles. Some of these styles amount to new ways of reasoning about crime and criminals, drawing upon advances in the statistical and clinical sciences. Others, such as ethnographic and sociological criminology, resurrect forms of inquiry which were brought to bear upon crime long before the idea of a criminological science emerged in the late nineteenth century (Garland, 1992, p. 413).

In a more literal way, than Garland (1992) suggests in this previous excerpt, the current project underpins the development of "doing criminology" through the multiplication of writing styles. While scholarship on this issue considers the manner in which knowledge and discourse alter throughout paradigm shifts, this is not easily separable from how style shifts across time. It is not only that the knowledge base and form of methodological investigation alters, but that the writing—as an instrument of knowledge—differs. While Lombroso wrote of monsters and dragons using a gothic storytelling device (Rafter & Ystehede, 2010), contemporary criminology is lofted upon new story devices and

narratives techniques, procedures and practices, as well as beliefs about the nature of writing—such as what counts as clarity or evidence.

While the originating paradigm in criminology—consisting of the rise in statistics, psychiatry, and social application—cannot be forgotten as producing seminal works and guidelines of research in the field, the 20th century indeed demonstrated a proliferation of differing criminological knowledge and styles. The 20th century witnessed an emergence in criminology by which groups of criminologists wished to oppose the innate pragmatism in the functional utility of 19th-century criminology (Garland, 1992; Young, 2011). Although many circles still sustained overwhelming strength in positive science, sociological perspectives undergirded by a philosophical interpretive lens became prevalent in the 20th century.

The first half of the 20th century witnessed the evolution of 19th-century biological positivism into psychological positive science (i.e. psychoanalysis and personality traits) and a celebrated turn towards a sociological lens. The sociological turn in criminology is often considered ushered in by Edwin Sutherland who rejected individualistic explanations of crime (Laub, 2004; Laub, 2006; Laub & Sampson, 1991). Seen as a progressive movement away from biological positivism, Sutherland's sociological contributions have been commended as the most important and significant addition—since Lombroso's paradigm shift (Rafter, 2005a)—in the history of criminology (Cullen, 2011; Laub, 2006; Laub & Sampson, 1991). Sutherland saw the new positivist inquiry of personality traits and defects as a rebirth of Lombrosian methods and offered studies of white-collar crime as a criticism to deterministic notions that crime is constituted through psychopathic defects in destitute populations. White-collar crime undermined the notion

of pauperism, that inferiority and feeble-mindedness were interconnected with social characteristics such as poverty and crime. Sutherland sought to produce a sociological conception of crime, eventually termed differential association, where attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of crime are learned through social interaction—effectively providing a theoretical platform for understanding crime of destitute populations as well as white-collar environments.

Methodologically, the sociological turn was still dominated by statistics attempting to produce causal laws of behavior. Following Sutherland's refocusing of criminology into a sociological lens, a new group of criminologists began to attack this positivist framework that undergirded the history of criminological analysis. As Garland (1992) notes, a group of 1960s British criminologists was the first "to seek to break away from the policy-oriented positivism and eclecticism of their teachers, in preference for a more sociological and theoretical style of work" (p. 415). The originating group of criminologists attempting to break away was termed labeling theorists. Labeling theory—formulated through a symbolic interactionism paradigm—challenged the very nature of positive inquiry and the desire to assess causal explanations of criminal behavior. Instead, labeling theorists saw crime control and criminality as part of the same definitional machine. Deviance involved constructing a definition particular to values that identified specific marginalized groups in the sights of criminal justice control.

In the second half of the 20th century, labeling theory gave way to an even more eclectic group of theoretical work in criminology often labeled as critical criminologists. Critical criminology serves as an overarching label for a wide array of different perspectives including Marxist, feminist, post-structural, cultural and left-realist, and so

on. Critical theorists in criminology fully rejected positivist methods of understanding crime in modernity and regarded criminal justice as a tool of oppressive power that sustained and reproduced bourgeois values. Crime discourse, then, is seen to involve the construction of a political economy of power and oppression throughout modern society, and, as Foucault (1995) would eventually assert criminological science would itself become a language to validate oppression within the modern penal institution.

Although the 20th century witnessed an array of different circles that attempted to break away from the "policy-oriented positivism" ushered in throughout the previous century—full of differing philosophical assumptions and writing styles—they still were forced to come to terms with the realities and exigencies of publishing requirements in leading journal outlets. Regardless of the underlying assumptions of new forms of knowledge-building, academics were tasked with tying their particular assumptions and conventions into the expectations of journals and publishing requirements in order to be considered successful, promoted and tenured. While this positive-influenced history obviously affects methodology in contemporary criminology, it likewise affects writing conventions and practices involving what counts as evidence, structural presentations of findings, types of arguments made, beliefs on clarity, and the amount of subjectivity allowed in research. In this sense, to write in a particular style is to conform and reproduce the very prevailing philosophical and ideological dynamics one is attempting to resist in their content.

Methodological writing differences: Quantitative-qualitative divide. While the sociological turn began a proliferation of different approaches to criminological knowledge, and in turn, an array of different writing techniques and tactics, the influence

of positivism on criminological writing cannot be understated. The tendency to use quantitative methods and objective language to emphasize the real and the scientific influences much of the writing practice in criminology. Despite the multiplication of writing styles, the contemporary image of criminological writing in the publishing world exists within the confines of the positive imagination.

A powerful example of this is the well-documented division in all social sciences, but especially prominent in criminology, is the partition between qualitative and quantitative methodological paradigms (Buckler, 2008; DiCristina, 2000; Higgins, 2009; Jacques, 2014; Tewksbury, DeMichele & Miller, 2005; Tewksbury, Dabney & Copes, 2010; Tewksbury, 2009; Worrall, 2000). Scholars have levied criticisms towards quantitative methods noting the level of power the current paradigm of methodology occupies. For instance, Tewksbury, Dabney and Copes (2010, p. 398) uncovered that qualitative articles make up the minority (5.74% domestic journals; 27.65% international) of articles accepted into criminological journals and Copes, Tewksbury and Sandberg (2016) determined that qualitative articles "account for no more than 1 in 10 published pieces" (p. 122). Similarly, Sever (2001) found that criminological textbooks, used to educate incoming scholars, focus predominantly on quantitative methods while providing a limited portion of the book to qualitative methodology. In tow, Buckler (2008) examined the extent to which doctoral programs train academics and found the overwhelming tendency for programs to train students in quantitative methodology and not qualitative. Other scholars have suggested that quantitative methodology is dominant in academe because of the structured tenure and promotion system that relies on publication number. Quantitative methodologies can often be a faster form of data

collection and analysis than qualitative methods. Thus, quantitative methods contain a market value for academics trying to advance through their careers (DiChristina, 1997; Worrall, 2000).

Particular methodological paradigms are based on considerably different philosophical paradigms. For instance, Higgins (2009) noted that quantitative methodology is based upon "empiricism and positivism" (p. 24). Higgins (2009) goes on to note that quantitative methodology is derived from the "physical and natural sciences" and notions of being "objective, formal and systematic" (p. 24) buttress it. Brent and Kraska (2010) note that quantitative methodology is founded upon "the work of Comte and Durkheim where the use of experiments, objectivity, exact measures, hypothesis testing, and quantitative methods are paramount" (p. 415). Thus, positivism became a paradigm for "combining deductive logic with precise empirical observations in order to discover and confirm a set of probabilistic causal laws that can be used to predict general patterns of human activity" (Kraska & Neuman 2008; see also Halfpenny 1982; In Brent & Kraska, 2010, p. 415).

In contrast, qualitative methodology is based on a different philosophical paradigm of social science—the interpretive paradigm. Coming from early constructivist interpretations, represented by Nietzsche's infamous statement that "there is no immaculate perception," and following Weber's understanding of "verstehen" – which explores experience within a social setting using an interpretive stance. Kraska and Neuman (2008) maintain that interpretive social science "emphasizes the systematic analysis and detailed study of people and text in order to arrive at understandings and interpretations of how people construct and maintain meaning within their social worlds"

(p. 74). The interpretive school is based on theoretical assumptions coming from early constructivist approaches – phenomenological and symbolic interactionism – and late constructivist approaches – postmodern, poststructural, postcolonial, feminist theory, and identity politics. From these philosophical and theoretical constructivist viewpoints, qualitative research underpinnings often imagine the human experience and the attribution of meaning as a fluid and dynamic process. In this sense, crime can be understood as part of a constructed reality; where a worldview and an identity are the results of a range of structural forces and dynamics.

The purpose of outlining these philosophical differences is to note that these methodological orientations require very different types of writing in criminology. In line with a socio-cultural lens, these methodological differences – bolstered by different philosophical lenses by which academics see the world – influence the writing of text in criminological publications. For instance, for the quantitative methodological paradigm that uses the positivistic, hypothetic-deductive model for social science, its philosophical underpinnings require a unique writing style. For instance, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) note that "Quantitative researchers use mathematical models, statistical tables, and graphs, and often write about research in impersonal, third-person prose." The third person, impersonal prose indicated by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) comes from the essentialist philosophical underpinnings of positivist-influenced quantitative methodology and demands objectivity and to "present and neutrally describe" through writing (Fox & Jennings, 2014). The essentialist perspective insists that there is a discoverable, objective and unmediated truth to the knowledge in the social science world. In turn, writing is simply a vehicle to convey discoverable truth. In this sense,

quantitative methodology demonstrates a powerful model of prediction and the construction of universal laws. Objectivity, as a fundamental and essential condition of social science, allows scientists to discover universal facts of life. The objectivity of essentialism in quantitative methods offers a powerful foundation for a writing process where neutrality reigns.

Linking this philosophy with the dynamics of criminology as a community, we demonstratively see this underpinning taking hold throughout scholarship. As mentioned previously, criminology scholars are often encouraged to avoid the use of personal pronouns, despite its acceptance in widely followed APA guides. This structuring of writing often removes the researcher from the text altogether ("this research demonstrates") and closely follows the conventional IMRAD structure of scientific articles (introduction, literature, methods, results, discussion). Indeed, the methodological paradigm influences writing elements such as the structure of argument used in the manuscript. As Pare (2011) maintains: "This sort of argument [a gap in the research], and conceptual framework it requires, is favored in the sciences and in quantitative research in the social sciences, where there is a sense of the gradual, incremental, and collaborative accumulation of knowledge toward shared agreement about some phenomenon or another" (p. 68). In contrast, qualitative allows for more digression from typical models and neutral language. However, the philosophical basis of positivism affects qualitative research as an avenue that should also demonstrate objective-based scientific principles. Moreover, as Pare (2011) continues about the impact of method on types of writing arguments: "… researchers in the humanities and in qualitative traditions

in the social sciences, however, are less concerned with establishing what might be considered a 'gap' in knowledge…" (p. 68).

Although there is no doubt that the criminological sciences have endured considerable changes in the multiplication of knowledge and inquiry styles, so too has there been differences in writing style. In line with the earlier testaments from Jameson (1961) and Rorty (1978), this section has demonstrated that philosophy infuses writing practices and values. Further, by situating criminological as a discourse community in its history we can understand the shifting and culturally dependent nature of good writing.

The Importance of Examining Writing in Criminology

In line with a writing studies theoretical framework, this dissertation makes the argument that examining perceptions of the most influential scholars in the field is an important area of research in order to understand good writing in the field. This is the case for a few reasons. First, this is the case because criminology is a discourse community that shares a particular set of writing assumptions, practice characteristics, and values. Through tenure and promotion, influence and conventions, positivist and sociological paradigms, writing becomes a normalized process that exists under the surface largely unnoticed. As Becker notes about collective processes (1963, p. 190):

> We often turn collective activity—people doing things together—into abstract nouns whose connection to people doing things together is tenuous. We then typically lose interest in the more mundane thing people are actually doing. We ignore what we see because it is not abstract, and chase after the invisible 'force' and 'conditions' we have learned to think sociology is all about.

Likewise, the act of writing in criminology as a collective process becomes buried as a mundane routinized practice of researchers. However, writing studies illuminate for us

that there are social and cultural forces at play underneath universal narratives of writing in criminology. That is, writing in criminology is a social enterprise where community members interact and negotiate practices and meanings attributed to them. Criminologists interact with other authors and may choose to conform and internalize the writing values and practices constructed within the criminological community. In contrast, writing is a site at which criminologists themselves may be deviant or act in resistance to mainstream writing rules or laws, and conventional forms of writing or analysis.

Second, it is important to study perceptions of the most influential scholars because within the criminological discourse community—by which socio-cultural definitions of writing are negotiated—influential scholars arguably hold the heaviest weight in the construction process. The most influential scholars act as "literacy brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2006) in the criminological field. As literacy brokers, influential scholars are able to affect literary practice and values in a number of ways. First, influential scholars produce a large proportion of the research literature. However, in turn, these scholars occupy high social status positions as editors and reviewers, they train new generations of scholars, act as readers on dissertations and for the work of colleagues, their writing techniques are emulated by upcoming scholars, and mold others in discussions on writing practice. That is, the most influential scholars influence upcoming generations of researchers through implicit and explicit socialization procedures. For instance, intense pressures to publish for promotion and tenure in the criminological academy powerfully influence upcoming scholars to mimic the styles of accomplished scholars published in criminological journals. Using published pieces as "text-partners" (Clark, 2007) or "mentor texts" (Fletcher, 2011), upcoming scholars imitate phrasing,

word choices and disciplinary practices that have proven successful. In a more explicit manner, the most influential scholars often mentor new generations of scholars and mold writing practices and values of new scholars through direct interactions.

A second manner by which the most influential scholars carry a heavy weight in honing cultural definitions of writing practice in criminology is through occupying high-status social positions in the publishing process. The most influential scholars often occupy positions as reviewers for elite journals and editors of the outlets. As editors, the most influential scholars carry a considerable weight in the negotiation of literate practices and attributed values. Likewise, Christopher Schreck, at the end of his term as the editor of the *Journal of Crime and Justice*, described the nearly unlimited power of the editor position in manuscript decisions:

> …an editor is much like a being with supernatural powers. Assuming that a journal's parent organization governs with a light hand, the journal is a universe to shape literally as the editor wills—we have the authority to accept or reject manuscripts, we assign reviewers (a power not to be lightly dismissed), we can respect reviewers' recommendations or not, and we can recognize colleagues with editorial board memberships. Journals thus often assume the distinct character, taking the form influenced by the editors' experiences, prejudices, erudition and integrity (Schreck, 2006, p. iv).

Additionally, contemporary research on peer review has questioned whether the practice is drifting away from its original intention of securing rigor and quality and instead becoming focused on the preference of the reviewers. Peer review was originally imagined as a method to sift out papers that failed to conform to scientific principles (Kronick, 1990; Lindsey, 1991). Contemporaneously, blind review is universally considered to be a key mechanism in producing quality work in the publication process

(Herron, 2012, p. 2275; Jefferson et al., 2002). Seminal works on blind review have established consensus surrounding its primary purposes, which predominantly focus on improving and controlling the quality of published information (Rowland, 2002, p. 1).

Despite the 200 year history in which peer review has been considered a mechanism for quality improvement, it is only in the previous few decades that individual disciplines—in the physical and social sciences—have begun to scrutinize, question and evaluate how effectively it works (Herron, 2012; Jefferson et al., 2002; Kronick, 1990). Although there is some evidence demonstrating that peer review practices can improve manuscript quality (Gardner & Bond, 1990; Goodman et al., 1994; Locke, 1985), a considerable amount of empirical research has also demonstrated a range of concerns, including that peer review can be vulnerable to bias (Ceci & Peters, 1984; Horrobin, 1996; Maddox, 1992; Lock, 1988; Wenneras & Wold, 1997), that it may limit innovation and the production of new ideas (Ceci & Peters, 1982; Horrobin, 1990), and that it can demonstrate inadequate reliability among reviewers (Lindsey, 1988).

These empirical evaluations have begun to lend insight to how peer review in practice departs from its original intentions. Whereas peer review was historically a measure to ensure scholarship met rigorous scientific principles, presently the competitive landscape of publication means evaluative practices are more selective; or rather, "it may be that subjective questions on the use of method, style, innovation, texture, and approach are now more important than the adequacy of the design" (Lindsey, 1991, p. 314). The relatively scant research conducted on peer review in criminology, which has examined reviewers' views and post-publication measurements of quality, has corroborated notions that academic excellence can often rest outside objective indicators

of quality, and instead, focus on socio-cultural distinctions that signify symbolic boundaries (Lamont, 2009; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2008; Worrall, 2015).

Despite the notion that peer review is in place to assess the objective quality of the research, studies on peer reviewing and journal editors reveal that the writing style plays a particularly large part in whether the research is publishable. For instance, Mustaine and Tewksbury (2008) find, in a surveyed sample of peer reviewers, that the quality of writing is in the top three assessments of recommending a manuscript for publication—following only "clarity of the findings" and "quality of the methods" (p. 360). Additionally, even when the quality of writing is not a primary reason in decision-making it has been found to considerably affect the majority of (92.3% of the sample) reviewer decisions on manuscripts (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2008).

From a writing studies perspective, then, writing is a socio-cultural phenomenon that often influences success in the particular discourse community. Likewise to understand criminology as a community, insinuates that influential scholars that occupy high-status positions play a large role in producing the contemporary iterations of style, best practices, and values attributed to them. In turn, investigating the perceptions of the most influential scholars provides a unique look into the current complicated terrain of criminological writing practices and values. At their heart writing practices and values are an introspective topic consisting of negotiated philosophies and constructed practices endemic to an academic culture. Considering that writing style is subject to the relative conditions of a field's studied objects and culturally-embedded definitions of excellence (Lamont, 2009), perceptions provide a powerful means to garner insight on the shared culture writing values in criminology.

Epistemologically, reflexivity and introspective research emphasize the perspective-based role of the researcher in how knowledge is organized, packaged and produced through social activity (Altheide & Johnson, 1994; Haraway, 1988). Reflexive investigations into methodologies endemic to the social sciences have been argued to have a necessary place in providing a greater understanding of knowledge construction processes (Denzin, 1997). Particularly researchers have wondered in what ways "our subjectivity becomes entangled in the lives of others" (Denzin, 1997; Mauthner & Doucet, 2003, p. 416). In turn, reflexivity and introspective research can provide a lens to investigate normal science processes, particularly as to the manner in which individual subjectivity and the larger academic culture have influence over constructing literate norms relative to criminology. Methodologically, experiences provide a connection between the shared writing culture of criminology and the interactions between discourse community members that construct it.

Particularly, reflexive information on writing from perceptions of the most influential criminologists represents a powerful source of introspective, scientific data on literate practices. Reflexivity on values and practices in writing style within the criminological culture can be converted into data, and in turn, the writing process can become an examinable scientific topic. Thus, the current study draws on 40 interviews with influential scholars using perceptions to contextualize a broad picture of criminology's terrain and couch those perceptions within a writing studies framework.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Methodological Epistemological Framework

The methodological framework used in this project stems from the rich history of grounded theory qualitative epistemologies. Throughout the previous four decades, there have been much debate and contest concerning the epistemological foundations of grounded theory analytics (Apramian, Christancho, Watling & Lingard, 2017). Thus, grounded theory has been utilized across the social sciences in a range of varying manners: positivist underpinnings concerned with objective truth (Glaser, 1992), theory-generating objectives (Strauss & Corbin, 1997), constructivist and interpretively-situated forms (Charmaz, 2011; 2014), and the situationally-focused (Clarke, 2005). Generally, these later qualitative, grounded theory perspectives are a byproduct of the interpretive social science approach.

The interpretive school emerges from a number of epistemological and ontological constructs; specifically coming from early-constructivist approaches (i.e. phenomenological and symbolic interactionism) and late-constructivist approaches (i.e. postmodern, poststructural, postcolonial, feminist theory, and identity politics). From these philosophical and theoretical constructivist viewpoints, grounded theory analytics refers to the nature of human groups, social interaction, objects, the human as an actor, human experience and the attribution of meaning as a fluid and dynamic process.

In relation to this project, literate practices can be understood as part of a constructed reality; where ontological positions are the result of a range of forces and dynamics.

Generally, the purpose of grounded theory is to generate basic social theory. This is accomplished by using an analytic-inductive approach to understanding data and social processes. According to the nuanced epistemological perspectives on grounded theory, analytic-induction can be accomplished in a number of alternative ways. However, the analytical framework in the current project falls in between the analytic-inductive approaches of Charmaz (2014) and Clarke (2005). On one hand, Charmaz (2014) sees the production of social theory through analytic-induction as a process of revealing "links between concrete experiences of suffering and social structure, culture, and social practices or policies" (Charmaz, 2011, p. 362). This is accomplished as respondents speak through the researcher. In this constructivist approach to analytic-induction, the role of the researcher is to break apart stories and reframe them to highlight broad thematic social patterns.

On the other hand, Clarke's (2005) situational analysis heralds analytic-induction from a postmodern and late-constructivist vantage. Unlike preceding grounded theory frameworks, situational analysis is often hyper-focused on the margins of the data to demonstrate fruitful differences, exceptions, and paradoxes that are often overlooked. By focusing on differences, Clarke (2005) poses theory-building not on what is common within a situation but rather on the elements that fracture commonality across situations. Like Charmaz's (2014) interest on giving voices to marginalized groups by allowing the respondent to speak through the researcher, Clarke (2005) focuses on the way exceptions illuminate what is missing or silenced across situations.

The grounded theory analytical framework used in this project occupies an intermediate point between Charmaz's (2014) constructivist and Clarke's (2005) situational-focused epistemologies. With Charmaz (2014) this study fractures the stories of respondents and reframes them into broad categories by which we may begin to discuss literate practices in criminology; whereas with Clarke (2005), this study also focuses on differences among these categories and the ways that scholars often deviate on consensus over literate practices. Yet, primarily this analytical framework borrows from both authors in order to give voice to a rarely discussed topic and to illuminate the invisible process of writing in criminology.

Research Questions

The current study has multiple purposes and intents. First, and broadly, this dissertation aims to provide a working understanding of "good writing" in the field of criminology. From a writing studies socio-cultural perspective, discourse communities have distinct norms and give unique values to their writing practice and criminology considerable lags behind other disciplines in understanding the introspective, normal science process of writing. Thus, this study uses influential scholar perceptions to understand the unique terrain of common writing practice and values in criminology. Second, the broad theoretical question of this dissertation investigates the extent to which the way that criminology imagines writing is different from how it actually works. By putting scholar perceptions within a writing studies framework—that juxtaposes the universal and socio-cultural—this dissertation complicates the homogenous nature of universal narratives on writing practice and value to investigate how style works. The research questions for this project are as follows:

(1) What are the elements of the most discussed literate practices from interviews with influential scholars?

(2) What are the values of good writing in criminology according to discussions with influential scholars?

(3) How can these results be understood within a writing studies and literary framework that juxtaposes universal and socio-cultural perspectives?

Sample

Data for this study consisted of 40 semi-structured interviews with top scholars in the field of criminology. In order to produce a sample, the author used Walters' (2015) study that assessed the top 100 most influential criminologists over the previous five years. Walters (2015) intended to produce a broadened and more complete definition of scholarly productivity by "incorporating both empirical indices of both quantity and quality… and applying these indices to both total and first author publications" (p. 2011). Other researchers have also documented the "stars" in criminology. For instance, Cohn and Farrington (2007; 2011) analyzed scholarly influence in criminal justice and criminology journals from 1986-1990 and 1990-2000 respectively. Likewise, Orrick and Weir (2011) assessed sole and lead authorship in a category of elite journals. However, by applying indices of quantity and quality to first author and total publications, Walters (2015) developed the most recent comprehensive list to date showing the fingerprint of individual criminologists on the field of contemporary knowledge.

Scholars were selected in Walters' (2015) list of the most influential criminologists through a random sampling procedure. This project used a random number generator to create fifty-four numbers between one and one hundred. The generated

numbers were then applied to Walters' (2015) list of the 100 most influential criminologists. Selected criminologists were sent a request for an interview through email. If there was no response within a month, the author sent out a second round of follow-up emails. In this project, 14 of the participants did not respond leaving an ending sample of 40 interview participants. Of the 40 participants, 31 participants in the sample consisted of full professor status and nine were at a lower university rank.

Data Collection

The current study and research design were approved by the University of Louisville institutional review board. Participants engaged in a semi-structured interview. Interviews consisted of a series of questions that attempted to draw out thoughts about the general and individual writing procedures and philosophies. However, the semi-structured nature of the interview meant that interviews were dynamic and the interview guide questions were not strictly followed. The time spent on questions often differed greatly between respondents as individuals resonated with different questions. Due to the distance between universities, interviews were conducted over the phone and through Skype. While at home, the author used Skype and a recording program to audio-record interviews. When at the university, the author used the speaker function of the office phone and recorded on a personal device. All participants were made aware of the audio-recording procedure through the acknowledged preamble consent or verbally before the interview began.

Interviews originally were expected to be relatively brief. At the beginning of the project, the interviewer allotted between twenty and thirty minutes for a phone interview. However, as the interviewer grew more comfortable with the interview guide

conversations extended in time. The shortest interview was the first, which lasted 17 minutes, while the longest conversation extended over two hours. Conversations averaged fifty minutes and thirty seconds (50:30). The interview guide was broken into four distinct sections, including general practices of writing in criminology, history of the writer, individual practices in writing publications and philosophies about style in writing. Besides being more comfortable, a second reason interviews grew in length is that questions were added. The dynamic nature of the semi-structured guide afforded the opportunity to add questions as they developed throughout the course of interviews. Some of the most profound questions were molded by conversations with criminologists. Indeed, in this way, the criminologists that were interviewed played a part in developing the interview guide through an interactional process.

Analysis

In a philosophical sense, this project uses grounded methodology through qualitative analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1997). Grounded theory is a general methodology similar to the analytic-inductive approach. The intention is to develop a theoretical understanding of the issues from the data that is gathered and analyzed. The author intended to "generate theory and [do] social research" simultaneously (Glaser, 1978). Interviews are intended to garner the social reality of a particular group. All interviews were transcribed in full and qualitatively coded using a three-step methodology. The author did not elect to use a computer program but hand-coded the interviews.

Analysis for this project involved consolidating a considerable amount of data from 40 interviews. To begin analysis the data were "chunked" into seven broad categories that emerged from the data. Chunks were created in this process around

organically different topics that repeatedly emerged throughout the course of interviews. These included: 1) good writing (i.e. what characteristics does a good criminological writer need to have?); 2) disciplinary differences (i.e. how does writing in criminology differ from other fields?); 3) individual practices (i.e. beliefs about individual writing techniques); 4) personal history (i.e. the history of scholars learning to write); 5) the sections of writing (i.e. beliefs about different sections of the scientific article look like in criminology); 6) style and creativity (i.e. beliefs about the role that creativity plays in one's writing); 7) writing rules and concepts (i.e. beliefs about broader writing practices, such as peer review). After consolidating the data into seven chunks, data analysis continued by conducting an open coding in which the author combed the data line-by-line in each chunk. This process revealed a number of topics that emerged in conversations with authors. This process of coding distilled the 7 large chunks into 31 codes more specific codes in the data. At that point, each code was analyzed for themes, which involve finding varying elements of the specific code.

In order analyze the codes for themes, three steps of grounded theory methodology involved an open coding, axial coding, a hierarchal coding. Open coding involved examining the text in full and marking potential emerging themes. Axial coding involved coding the emerging typologies and patterns, in which the author interprets differences between parallel themes. Last, the hierarchal coding involves organizing and grouping themes underneath larger latent constructs. The narrative in this study does not attempt to, and could not possibly, use the entirety of the data uncovered throughout the course of interviews. Large the narrative in the results is drawn from a few chunks. Chapter five, which investigate literate practices is largely drawn from the "individual

practices" chunk. Chapter six, which investigates values of good writing, is drawn from the "good writing." Finally, chapter seven—which analyzes the philosophical principles of writing in criminology through a writing studies lens—draws from "good writing" as well as "style and creativity."

Role of the Researcher

Scholars regularly provided insightful and provocative information that can only be accumulated over years of successes, trials and tribulations. Nonetheless, criminology is a field that rarely discusses literate practices in a formal sense. For this reason, at times, in order to discuss writing topics it became important to draw out information using probes. This often came in two different forms: experience and paradox probes. Experience probes often involved drawing out information by using the author's current graduate experience as a platform for information. For example, recent experiences with peer review served as a platform to discuss the current state of peer review in criminology, its efficacy as a blind review system and potential other review models. Likewise, recent experience learning how to write scientific articles led to conversations surrounding the elements of writing a literature review, for instance, in criminology. Second, at times, it became necessary to utilize paradox questions to draw out further information. This often involved taking a point being made to an extreme to force the respondent to make a judgement about the scenario. This was effectively highlighted in the results of this dissertation, in which a "bullet-point" question was fashioned to take the definitions of clarity—as short and concise—to its extreme.

Likewise, the researcher played an important role in taking steps to ensure credibility and trustworthiness in the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An important aspect

of naturalistic inquiry involves taking measures to ensure that the study contains credibility, in which the researcher demonstrates that the findings are congruent with reality. In this study, numerous steps were taken to identify credibility in the study. For one, this draws from methodological paradigms that are well-accepted, and widely used, in qualitative research. Qualitative paradigms drawn from in this study—that of Charmaz (2008) and Clarke (2005)—are widely used and recognized in the social sciences. Additionally, a second measure of trustworthiness involves a development of familiarity with the culture being studied prior to data collection (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this case, the researcher is part of the community in which they are investigating, creating both a familiarity and establishing a level of trust between researcher and participant. Third, trustworthiness is establishing through a use of random sampling to eliminate the potential of research bias in the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This project used a random sampling procedure that was cross-reference with an independently constructed list of scholar influence in criminology. Last, this project established credibility by regular debriefing and peer scrutiny on the project (Lincoln, & Guba, 1985). The researcher regularly reported general findings to the dissertation chair and engaged in discussions that resulted in feedback to improve research procedures.

CHAPTER 5: HOW DO SCHOLARS WRITE?

The first research question of this project considered the common writing practices found in criminology, and thus, this section identifies beliefs about best practices. The purpose of this section is to investigate the individualized beliefs about how the most productive scholars practice and approach writing. Due to their individualized nature, beliefs about practices varied across interviews. The remainder of this chapter investigates a number of practices endemic to, and surrounding, writing in criminology; such as approaches to getting started, blocks of time for writing, drafting, authorship, and journal selection. All of the discussed practices are pertinent to the final product of a publishable piece of writing.

Despite the assumption of this project that writing is an integral part of producing science, among criminological scholars there was mixed consensus on whether writing practice was an important part of science at all. While the majority of scholars believed that writing was paramount to criminological science, there was some dissent over the importance of writing as part of the scientific enterprise. Generally, many scholars took the dynamic perspective of Author 17, which ranged from writing as an indicator of quality science to writing as a part of the intellectual process of research: "Writing is critically important [to science]. I find that when I review a manuscript for a journal after one or two pages I usually have a pretty good sense of the general level of the

paper. If it's poorly written that's a bad sign right off the bat" (Author 17). This view was commonplace and, at the least, it was believed that quality writing provided a signal as to whether the author had put similar care into data collection, analysis, research design, and other parts of the scientific enterprise. At the most, writing was seen to be an important aspect of the intellectual exercise, where writing was the site of peeling back layers, conceptualizing and linking concepts together:

> I think that writing is a critical part of the intellectual exercise itself. There are many times when I've convinced myself that I had some brilliant thought and I've worked out a problem—an intellectual problem. "Oh, this is great, clear, clear as a bell to me." I've tried to write it up and I can't get it down on paper. That means that I haven't really thought it through as clearly as I thought and I didn't understand it as well as I thought I did until I had to put it in words, sentences and paragraphs" (Author 17).

Author 17 demonstrates that the importance of writing goes beyond insinuating care of the research, and instead, represents writing as an integral step of the research process. Particularly, writing is depicted as a way to dig down and find conceptual clarity in one's work. Although a framework for a paper can often seem clear in one's head, Author 17 represents writing as the point at which it forces concepts to be logically and cogently connected. In other words, it is the site at which one investigates as to whether their conceptual framework is viable.

Yet, some scholars provided dissent to the notion that writing is very important. Their perspective insisted that words could often cloud the way, and eventually with enough massaging, the science would shine through: "It's [writing] not a necessary skill to be a scientist. You could be a criminologist, you could be a biologist. Writing is just not something we are taught or emphasized. It is about the science and about the

theory…writing is a skill that is certainly beneficial but it is not necessary" (Author 10). In this view, that closely mimics Millers' (1979) classification of universal knowledge on writing, writing is seen as separate and distinct from the research, design, the science and the idea: "you know I am not sure that writing is always tied to success...because you can have important papers that are published in very good journals that are very hard to read...Usually, a science or a theory [is primary], then the quality of the writing is secondary" (Author 10). From this view, words themselves are not seen as contributive to the science as a site where sentences and paragraphs are part of the intellectual exercise. This exists in contrast to the previous excerpt (Author 17) that suggested writing to be endemic to the construction of the ideas behind the science; that the words allow the production of knowledge by linking, connecting and intertwining concepts.

Even if writing is not seen as an important aspect of the scientific endeavor, scholars recognized writing as a paramount feature of getting a manuscript accepted for publication: "On the other hand, it takes longer but I'm getting better cause when I first sent out articles I had an 80% rejection rate. Now I have an 80% revise and resubmit or accept with revision rate. Once you have the idea down, it's how you present it. So writing does matter" (Author 25). Although authors were divided on whether writing was a part of the scientific enterprise, they generally agreed that the presentation of writing mattered. Individual writing practices are techniques of presentation where the improved presentation increases the odds of one's chances of success. In this sense, where presentation and communication underpin the rationale behind publishing, as Author 29 notes, "there is no reason why I can't solve something with my writing."

Regardless of which side of the fence scholars fall on in their beliefs of writing, research has demonstrated that upcoming scholars emulate through reading, learn from and follow conventions largely produced by the most influential scholars in the field (Casanave & Li, 2008; Hedgecock, 2008; Flowerdew & Li, 2009). High-status positions in the community automatically bestow a particular amount of writing capital upon members of the most influential group of scholars, where producing research in quantity (e.g. a number of publications) and quality (e.g. articles in the highest tier outlets) is equivalent to dominating the conventions of literate practices in the field. Important to the scientific endeavor or not, learning conventional literate processes in the field is a contingency of academic success. In turn, this section investigates the beliefs of the most influential scholars on how they do writing; that is to say, their writing practices and other literate issues that surround the actual writing practice itself, and which, eventually, plays a part in the culmination of a final published product.

Getting Started: From the Head and the Heart

The act of producing good writing takes a staggering amount of creativity. On one hand, good writing in criminology rests on producing an engaging text that formulates an effectively connected storyline. On the other hand, text choices are identity choices where authors orient themselves within sub-disciplinary groups. Thinking back to Fairclough's (1992) model of writing, writing is a social interaction where individual text choices are mediated by a larger context. Put in the continuing narrative, criminological writing involves a negotiation between the writing of an individual and the larger disciplinary conventions and scientific assumptions of the field. It is no surprise, then, that researchers have documented the way new scholar's struggle deciding how to begin a

new manuscript and often suffer from writer's block type scenarios where the most difficult part of a project is simply getting started, narrowing down the topic or producing a plan for the writing (Kamler & Thomson, 2004; 2014). Indeed, pivotal research has demonstrated that students who fail to finish their dissertation do so because of writing-related issues and anxieties (Torrance & Thomas, 1994). Thus, it should also not be surprising, that one's approach to getting started and beginning writing became a topic of conversation among the most influential scholars in criminology.

Particularly, authors' suggestions for getting started revolved around two particular methodologies for beginning to write: writing from the heart and the head. These are most effectively outlined in the following quote: "So I have got to write it all. I have to write it all and it doesn't matter to me what it looks like. I have taken the perspective that the first draft comes from the heart and the second draft comes from my head" (Author 20). This distinction between the head and the heart effectively identifies a primary division between methods in approach to starting a new manuscript. Some took the approach that one should draft from the heart; or that is, they should use an artistic brainstorming type of writing that allowed them to narrow the topic or create intellectual bridges between concepts. In other words, similarly to what we saw with Author 17 at the beginning of this chapter, some authors noted that writing can be a part of the intellectual exercise and act as a way to refine one's ideas. Others took the approach that one should draft from the head; where outlining served as a guide or a map and allowed the author to construct a solid organizational plan. This division, however, was not hermetic; that is, many authors indicated–like Author 20—that they use both the head and the heart. While different approaches are beneficial for different authors, both writing from the heard and

the heart are, at their core, a way of thinking about what one wants to say. In this way, both approaches are slightly different ways to get thinking; where one focuses on conceptual clarity and the other the ordering of concepts; and thus, as Author 29 notes: "A lot of people have writer's block. I don't think that is writer's block, I think that is thinker's block. They really don't know what they want to say for an article, as far as writing." Thus, the following is a catalog of the ways in which the most influential authors decide what they want to say in their writing.

From the heart. Writing from the heart is the first of two categorical approaches to beginning writing a manuscript per the most influential scholars. As one author noted "I think there are two styles of how to write: one is to write as you think and the other is to think first and write second…You structure the ideas and then you fill in the blanks" (Author 29). Writing from the heart is to "write as you think;" it implies an artistic process where the author uses a type of unstructured drafting to hone conceptual ideas, to link concepts together and to find an effective starting point. Writing from the heart is a process of discovering what words one is going to say and uncovering thematic and conceptual underpinnings by peeling back layers. For these authors, ideas not fully realized need to be splattered on paper and organized later on:

> …but, I need to get my ideas out now, I'm ready to start and so that's when I turn to the page and I start writing and a lot of times concepts that were not fully formed when I started writing actually do. Like they just sort of appear on paper and somehow the writing process helps me organize my thoughts. So, then I've actually done it a few times when I'm actually quite surprised, you know, when I write something, "I'm like huh, that is pretty good." You know, I didn't think of that before – thank you fingers. So yeah for some reason – something between the integration of my brain and fingers works a bit better for me than just my brain alone (Author 7).

Writing from the heart involves the process where writing helps brainstorm what one wishes to discuss in the manuscript; a place of experimentation in which the author can explore whether the conceptualization of the paper that exists in their brain is viable on paper. Authors often discussed the importance of the introduction in this regard. The introduction was a place of summary where the concepts are laid out and connected in a way that will guide the remainder of the paper. Thus, the introduction was an ideal place to discover what the rest of the paper would become:

> I just sit down and start writing those first few pages where I lay out what is the problem like I told you before, I don't write from outlines… I know what the structure of the paper is going to be and I know after I write the introduction which is going to be a layout like I told you I do, when I write a paper, any paper that you will see my name on, it has the first two or three pages describe the problem, identify the gap or issues that the paper is going to examine, describe how it does it and describe what can be found…everything tends to flow very naturally (Author 27).

Finding what one is going to say involves an element of experimentation of what feels natural and organic in the text; in which the points seamlessly come together. Rather than using a structured outline, the author uses the introduction as a way to discover whether the connections will be effective. The introduction serves as a creative hub for this process where concepts can be linked and this allows authors to decide on transitions between points and sections of the paper: "I usually do my introduction first…But usually, I do at least a draft of the introduction first because it kind of helps me organize my thought, to stay on topic for the literature review…" (Author 7).

For some, the heart method was purely about uncovering the primary theme of the paper which was a thinking exercise that took a considerable amount of work. Often this

results in a writing process that lacks formality and emphasizes creativity as well as trial and error. Often writing from the heart meant simply writing informally and then supplementing the document later on with necessary citations, scientific information, and grammatical elements:

> Yeah, my first drafts are full of empty parenthesis where I know that you know this study so I will put the last name of the study or I know the name of the study but I can't remember the year so I just skip over it… I know it might interrupt the continuity of my writing by trying to sift through you know my stack of papers so I just insert "cite" or something like that, and then…because I very much use, of course, I use prior literature but I rely on my own ideas you know and so the citations are really just there to remind me that citations are there to support what I am arguing so I don't need to look at someone else's stuff to know what I am talking about… (Author 7).

But, at times, the creative process could be more chaotic, with a flurry of drafts and trials of writing in a relentless attempt to find an effective method of presentation. Writing from the heart involves writing as an excavation where authors brainstorm to find links between concepts. These often result in an archeological writing practice where complex ideas as distilled into simple connections, phrases, and sentences:

> My style in drafting manuscripts, it's very highly disorganized. It is trial and error. I start over fifteen times or more. There is no rhyme or reason. It is highly inefficient… I use a standard framework but do not write in a standard order. I write title and abstract even before doing the research. I prepare dummy tables before I have the real data. I rewrite many times. I start over many times, maybe a dozen, always rethinking the topic. I revise as I write, and abandon many versions, sometimes whole papers. Simple sentences are central (Author 21).

Although authors do this to different degrees, writing from the heart seems to be heavily centered on this process of digging down and uncovering what one is going to say in the piece.

From the head. In contrast to the writing from the heart where discovering the essence of what one wants to say was accomplished through a type of brainstorming-in-writing, writing from the head involved the use of outlining in order to structure a manuscript in which one already knows what they wish to say: "I tend to view writing a manuscript, particularly a journal article, kind of like—and it is a bad analogy—but sort of like building a house where you have to get a frame in place and then you can start adding on your interior and exterior walls and start laying insulation and things like that" (Author 24). Overwhelmingly, this was accomplished through drafts of outlines in which the authors slowly added to and reorganized the outline until it mimicked a paper: "I don't even write sequentially. I write the way I've taught others to do it, and that's outlining. You write the outline. Then you start making points into a sentence here and there. You put together the pieces of the puzzle. Nothing is ever final in it. You're constantly massaging it, moving pieces, doing new entries to points to tie to a point you just put before it. It's constantly moving the pieces of the puzzle around" (Author 11). Thus, the "from the head" approach involves a systematic and structural way of thinking about the ordering of concepts and their presentation.

The outline-based "from the head" approach took on different forms. For some, the trajectory of creative work involved from the heart brainstorming, the production of a title and then the endeavor of imagining how one would present the information to an audience. For others, it was more important to simply begin from the head and approach

writing by initially developing an outline wherein an author would utilize a fill-in-the blank type of technique: "Yeah, I find it personally more helpful to have an outline. So once I have the general questions researched, then I basically just bullet point out the outline of the article and since these things typically follow a typical format I just typically bullet point out each section…" (Author 5). Starting with an outline allowed an author to produce an "hourglass" (Author 3) type structure. As Author 1 notes, this involves beginning with a broad introduction, creating a funnel in the literature review that narrows the topic, demonstrating the narrow topic in the results, and then, zooming back out in the discussion or concluding section to demonstrate connections in literature and policy implications:

> You know, intro, lit review, methods, findings, discussion, so it is almost like, if you think of an article as kind of the storyline arch in a drama it sort of knows the turning point that has to be put in at every stage and your job as a writer is to kind of fill in the narrative into each of those points…So that is where it's big, we open up in a very broad way to give the context of… here is the perspective on the world that this paper will take, now narrow them down to, and here is the very specific idea that we would like to discuss (Author 1).

Since these practices were often identified as being slightly different from one another authors were not necessarily confined to one or the other. In other words, it was possible to use both the heart and the head to galvanize one's writing. While writing from the heart involved honing concepts through a process of discovery, as Author 20 noted in the beginning, it often led to writing from the head. Put differently, the process of discovering the thematic underpinning of the manuscript or writing the introduction under the trial and error principle could lead authors to a process of finding their structure, conceptual clarity, and presentation. As the following author notes, discovery

rests in finding the primary theme which can often be identified through establishing an introduction or a title for the paper. Once the main theme is discovered, the primary thinking and intellectual work are finished. As an example of how authors used writing from the heart and the head in combination, take the following quotes from Author 29:

> And that is why titles for me are important, because after I have arrived at a title then I know what the angle or theme or focus of my introduction is going to be, alright? Titles matter. Like people's names matter…let's say you don't have a title – well…how do you know what you are going to write? What is the point? What are you going to say? If you ask that of most people they may say 'Oh well, I'm not quite sure,' Right? If you are not quite sure than you are getting rejected (Author 29).

As the author notes, the intellectual exercise of producing the title demonstrates having already made the decision of what will be written in the remainder of the paper and what direction the paper will take. For author 29, the title is symbolic of the lifeblood of the paper and intellectual exercise brainstorming through the "from the head" approach. In addition to deriving the structure, the author notes that once the theme of the paper is clarified, through the title, it is easier to find the correct structure for the manuscript.

> I come up with a title because once I have a title I know what the theme of the article is going to be about; I know what most of the article is going to be about. When I am writing an article… where I haven't figured out ahead of time what the core of the article [is] or what the theme of the article is, the first thing I do is come up with a title. And usually that is the title I end up with; I change it sometimes. The second thing that I do is I outline in particular the introduction because in writing an article the introduction is the marketing of your idea… (Author 29).

As important as the finding the correct words, the conceptual clarity derived from discovering the primary theme leads to the author devising a conceptual map for the remainder of the piece. The author continues on by demonstrating that the production of

the title influences the sequence of points that will take place in the writing structure. Thus, writing from the head involves a considerably more structured approach than writing from the heart; in which, an author provides a structured outline and conceptual map of what points will be in the paper and where they should be placed:

> …everybody can have an outline. Everybody can make up a PowerPoint presentation. Everybody can build ideas one by one…If you give a very structured PowerPoint presentation then it is very clear to people what it is you are doing. All I am saying is that how you write, you have to write the outline or the PowerPoint Presentation first and then write. The process of writing means you have to think about "I am putting this idea first, this idea second, this idea third, given these ideas I can draw these conclusion"…the process of writing the outline and writing the PowerPoint presentation imposes structure on your writing and makes it clearer...that is the first rule of writing, do people understand what you are trying to say? And if you don't know what you are trying to say then it is hard to communicate to other people what you are trying to say. And that is why I start out with an outline of what I want to say, I already know what I want to say before I start to write, at least 95%. But in the writing process, I might come up with new ideas… (Author 29).

The previous author links writing from the head metaphorically to creating a PowerPoint presentation. As a heuristic tool, thinking of a paper as a PowerPoint—where each point occupies an individual slide—puts the author in a position in which they must consider how the audience would receive the information being disseminated.

Although a daunting task of writing for any scholar is that of getting started in the process of constructing a manuscript, in this study accomplished scholars identified two primary methodologies for getting started in writing: classified here as being from the heart and the head. A "from the heart" approach involved an exploratory process in order to excavate connections they wished to make in the manuscript. Although authors noted

they often had some conceptualization in their brain already, they also suggested that the effectiveness of these conceptualizations were tested by aligning their brain with their fingers. Thus, brainstorming on paper allows authors to test whether their concepts connect effectively and also allows them to find new conceptual connections. On the other hand, the "from the head" approach involved a structured and systematic manner of getting started on a manuscript. Particularly, this involved building the framework of the paper in situations in which the author was already confident of the connections they wished to make in the paper. Yet these two perspectives did not necessarily exist in contrast, as multiple authors identified that they use both modes of getting started. For instance, one author suggested that finding the core connecting mechanism was accomplished once they discovered the title of the manuscript. Afterwards, they could use a "from the head" approach to outline their paper in line with constructing a PowerPoint for a conference audience. The following section extends beyond the process of starting a manuscript and investigates the efficient use of time in writing.

Productivity and Blocks of Time

Beyond how authors get started, an undervalued aspect of writing is the consideration of *when* the most influential scholars write. For many influential scholars, a primary difference between accomplished and new authors is the devotion to simply sitting down and attempting to write. Writing is seen as a skill that, like anything, is a product of regular practice. Thus, the single most important way to write effectively is to make one's self start writing:

> One of the things I tell my student is "Well how do you write a lot?"…I get up I sit in my chair in front of the class, I turned around I pointed to my rear end, I pointed at the

> chair, I sat in the chair I pulled myself in and made like I was typing on a computer. "That is how you write. You sit your ass down in a chair and you do it." And that's the biggest problem that people have when they are writing articles" (Author 29).

Scholars identified that being a scholar was about doing the writing and that productivity is based on practicing writing by sitting down and engaging in it on a regular basis regardless of the quality of the output:

> …writing is a habit and if someone wants to get good at writing they have to just do it…and this is a truly irritating to me; people that want to sit around and talk about writing irritate me…Folks are like "I am writing on this, I am working on this" or whatever, but they are never really putting their fingers on a keyboard; that drives me crazy…Until you have started typing on it, it doesn't exist and I think that is a trap that a lot of folks have fallen into. That it sounds good to sound busy and that is something that sounds good; to actually be busy is good and it is a big difference from standing at the water cooler at the break room talking about what you want to be doing and that is a big difference from being in your room with the door shut, doing it (Author 20).

The most productive scholars take writing as the core aspect of their job and often see a week without writing as a failure. Thus, authors often have many projects in different stages at one point in time: "A lot of people when they write they have a paper they write and they go back and research for 6 months and then they go back to it maybe. This is not what people who write a lot do—they are always writing. They always have a paper on their desk; they have a paper to review, a paper on their desk, a paper in the presentation stage' (Author 29). Thus, a core aspect of productivity is working on many projects simultaneously. As the following author notes, authors should avoid putting all their confidence in one piece and instead have many in progress along multiple stages of producing scientific articles, and in turn, diffusing the importance of one accept or reject:

"I have up to 15 out on any given date. So if I get 5 rejection emails in one week then I will be mad but I will get a few R&R emails too. So right now, I am okay for this paper to sit here for 4 months because I have other irons in the fire; it is not my whole career" (Author 26). The author continues on to indicate how manuscript rejections can importantly factor into writing timelines. For instance, an author cannot stew on a rejection for too long. The author allows for a brief period where the rejection is grieved and then the article is turned around to be considered for publication at another outlet:

> …for me it is a 3-day rule, period. No matter which journal you get rejected from day one you are pissed off, day 2 you make revisions that you think are warranted and day 3 you send it to someone else. Because when you have a rejected paper that paper is going nowhere it is sitting on your computer and you already lost time when you sent it to that first journal. And now you are wasting time while it is sitting on your desk so you get mad, go out for a beer, complain to your friends about the reviewer, and then the next day you wake up fresh and then you go out and you know you revise and day 3 send it back out (Author 26).

As these previous authors have demonstrated productivity relies on the ability of an author to sit and write, to work on multiple projects at once, and a quick turnaround process to get rejections to another outlet.

Yet, this desire to always be writing conflicts with the busy and hectic life of academics. Academic life, at differing levels, is often filled with a range of responsibilities, including teaching, interactions with students outside of lecture times, collecting data, data analysis, planning projects, manuscript reviews, institutional review boards, service requirements, mentoring graduate students, term papers and class assignments, and so on. It is possible to exhaust one's work time each week with tasks

that do not involve the writing of manuscripts, which in itself, is a time-consuming endeavor:

> The point is when do you find time to write? Nights, weekends, summers? Or do you work really hard to get ahead in your classes and you create some space? I am just saying that the main problems with writing and writing articles is to have blocks of time to do the types of things that we are talking about here…this is when you know someone publishes a lot [if] they taught classes, they meet with students, they get to Friday, and they haven't written anything. They will say, "I've gotten nothing done this week"…if I am not writing then I am not getting anything done. If I do all of this other stuff then I am frustrated that I haven't been able to get anything; and when I write, I always have a paper or a book on my desk (Author 29).

Thus, due to the hectic nature of academic life, an important question emerges; when do scholars find time to write their manuscripts? Typically, authors noted that they preferred to schedule large blocks of time, often scheduling an entire day that completely revolves around writing. This often has to be coordinated with the common academic requirement of teaching. Thus, some scholars divided between teaching and non-teaching days and attempted to make non-teaching days their time for writing:

> Usually, I try to block off some time, sometimes it [is] depending on my schedule. I have teaching days and non-teaching days, and on teaching days I will spend most of those days doing it. So you know it is for me I like to have blocks of times for me to do it as opposed to an hour here and an hour there but when I get rolling I get rolling so I like to just go and get it done. So I mean as opposed to time completion of article, it all depends on the topic, you know, how much I have to do if I am collaborating with someone, how much time is my contribution going to take, how much is their contribution going to take (Author 6).

Interestingly, many of the most influential scholars had additional time-consuming responsibilities that ranged from being the editor of journals to fulfilling the

requirements of administrative roles. For this reason, the authors in these interviews had responsibilities that exceed typical academic roles which strained even further their availability to write. The following author laments the complication of fulfilling an administrative role and attempting to write:

> Preferably it would be in big blocks but, especially with my role now, I don't get that as much. It depends on where you are in your career, right now I am an administrator if I spend too much time on it I feel guilty that I am ignoring my other things and so it is probably finding the balance now is what is harder. And back earlier your life would revolve around it, so I didn't necessarily have to find that balance but now life commitments, job commitments, and other things, it is hard to find that time…I am not one that dwells on things…I am more of let's get it all down on paper and we will make it look pretty later (Author 40).

Breaks from semesters offer effective times to schedule large blocks of writing time. Academic calendars often provide winter, summer and spring breaks that allow authors to schedule entire days with the sole purpose of writing:

> I try to clean everything out and do binge writing. I can't write like for an hour here and an hour there. I need a day. I need to be able to sit down. I don't even like it if I have a day's writing and I know I have to go someplace later. I don't want to feel the pressure to have to write…I try to create as much, as many free days as I can to write. It can be weekend days, I use a lot of weekend days to write. Summers, I try to keep those as free as I can so I can do everything (Author 29).

Large blocks of time were popular among the authors most obviously because it afforded scholars the largest potential chance to make progress, but large writing blocks also were depicted as a tool to combat the need to warm up to writing. Often scholars mentioned the need to re-read manuscripts or remember where they had left off writing the previous time in order to warm up to the piece, and once again, find their writing

rhythm. Thus, big blocks allowed authors to warm up to the text and begin writing where they had previously ended: "I like big blocks, I used to when I had more time and fewer students to mentor and other life responsibilities I would schedule huge chunks of time because I am unable to quickly turn on and off when you are doing really serious writing" (Author 39).

In addition, a common notion was to schedule writing times for early mornings or late at night. These two times seemed to be particularly popular: "if I had a preference I would say to you, 'yeah, I am going to block off Monday and Tuesday to work on this paper and I know that I have to teach on this and that'… big chunks of time I would need. I did a lot of writing or do a lot of writing at night. I tend to enjoy writing at night. Or the first thing in the morning so…" (Author 39). As the author notes, writing at these early or late times of the day avoids intersecting with academic responsibilities during peak hours of the day. As previously mentioned many of these scholars are administrators or editors and must address these duties during the day. Likewise, authors noted that particular times evaded the added responsibilities that come with being in a leadership role:

> And there are things that I have to do to organize me that others don't have to do. So that this way I can move through a project without necessarily having to overcome too much, and over the years I have developed a system to do that. [*Does that involve a routine set of times to write?*]. Yeah, 7:00-10:30 and it's the flip side too— 7 am to 10:30 am and 7-10: 30 pm. Those are my peak writing times and if I can't get it done in that time I might as well have not written it. [*What does am and pm have to do with it?*] It is quiet. I can work at work or home office and everything is quiet. Seven to ten at home everything is settling down and is quiet, and then I can actually get focused (Author 20).

For accomplished scholars, writing time was considered a valuable resource, and in turn, scholars indicated multiple techniques to efficiently use their time. Whether through

scheduling large days for dedicated writing, routinely scheduled blocks of time, or identifying quick turnaround times for manuscripts rejected in the review cycle, scholars made efficient use of time using multiple techniques to maximize productivity in writing. Although one's use of time is vital to maximizing productivity, the following section investigates drafting speeds as another potential tool for securing high productivity levels.

Drafting: Draft Numbers and Speeds

The following section investigates the extent to which influential authors produce drafts of manuscripts. An integral aspect of becoming published involves an ability to improve one's manuscript by constructing an original draft and revising until ready to send to a journal outlet. Undeniably, the most productive scholars in criminology produce a staggering proportion of criminological research. In fact, the most productive authors' fingerprint on the publishing world is arguably even much larger than what is immediately visible. That is, through training doctoral students, co-authorship, invisible authorship, and so on, the most productive scholars mediate manuscript production as "literacy brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2006). Literacy brokers are those who have the capacity to mediate writing practices and production in numerous ways. In this sense, the most productive scholars in the world considerably influence, explicitly and implicitly, literate practices in criminology.

This literary concept can help us make two hypotheses about writing in criminology. First, and more generally to the entire project, one would expect writing practices in criminology to be generally homogenous across criminology and its scholars. Second, and specific to drafting, one could hypothesize that the immense productive power of the most influential scholars would require incredible drafting speed. The

excerpts in this section suggest a counter-narrative, and instead, indicate that authorship speed and drafting generally are widely disparate across individual scholars and that authors often narratively position themselves as slow drafters.

The speed of the draft. Surprisingly, criminology authors demonstrated a range of different speeds when discussing the production of manuscript drafts. In contrast to the obvious belief that writing speed of the most productive authors should be classified as having incredible pace, authors often characterized themselves as slow writers: "It takes a long time. I might spend 3 or 4 hours writing just a few paragraphs. It takes a long time to get the whole thing" (Author 30). Multiple authors took the following perspective:

> I often labor over every sentence of a paper and I'll often find that I will really criticize every sentence in an article once I have written it to make sure that every statement has a purpose and there is nothing superfluous and nothing is repeated unless I intend that repetition. But with that in mind, I categorize myself as methodical but I tend to work quickly but I try to balance that methodical approach of criticizing every statement, but at some point words just need to be on paper and get it done. So there is a little blend of both, but I'd like to think that I lean towards the methodical side than the other [fast] (Author 1).

Like this author, others indicated that they take great care identifying the appropriate placement of each word, sentence, and paragraph. Scholars often identified a slow process in drafting that involves making sure each piece of the manuscript has a point relative to the overall message. Beyond the writing, authors also suggested that the processes surrounding writing were slow-going. Although the process of writing words on paper could go slowly or quickly, the conceptualizing prior to drafting was often cast as time-consuming in itself:

> Well, I would characterize myself as kind of slow. Now if you are someone else you may say that "well, he kind of

> publishes a lot so he is fast," but what I do is I think and I usually have a paper outlined in my head before I even sit down. So I may have thought about a paper that I am going to write for maybe about 3 months before I write it. But I'll know exactly what I want to write when I sit down, and it will still take me a long time. Where I will go through it, I will read it, I will write it, I will sit on it, I will have other people read it. But I wouldn't characterize myself as a quick writer at all (Author 2).

Perhaps, the most interesting finding around drafting was the extent to which writing speed was constructed as a complicated phenomenon; particularly, as something that is not of the will of the writer but instead a resource that erratically comes and goes. That is to say, scholars indicated that one cannot force writing and an individual's writing speed may be dependent on extraneous circumstances: "When it does, it does. But sometimes it just don't. I will go through real periods where I write a lot and then I'll go through several months where I just can't bring myself to do it" (Author 11). Scholars indicated that writing was something that came to them intermittently and that the authors would attempt to harness moments that writing speed flowed quickly: "I think I write in bursts. So I'm off for a while and then I write a bunch. So it may be that I'm not a fast writer all the time that I'm working on the article but when I write, I write pretty fast" (Author 22). Against the central hypothesis of this section, authors' testaments suggested that even the most productive scholars defer to the intermittent nature of writing speed changes, rather than having a learned ability to call speed forth: "I'm kind of an episodic writer in the sense that I work in spurts. So I'll write and then I'll take a break and go back to it and take a break and go back. I need to leave and go back to it" (Author 14). This intermittent nature of writing speed has implications for how quickly drafts are completed and sent for publication: "In terms of a journal article, I've had articles that I

have written in one draft and I've had articles that have taken me months. I've had some that have taken me a couple years but it all just depends" (Author 15).

Rather, writing speed is identified by scholars as a frenetic process where writing comes and goes, and in which writing opportunity must be harnessed when possible: "…but other days I think I can do that but I don't have the flow and when that happens I'll just try to step away from it because I find myself getting angry" (Author 8). Writing speed, then, is less a manner of individual skill—or the ability to conjure a perfect paper immediately—and more a byproduct of taking opportunities when writing ability is present and ripe:

> I'm not going to stop in the middle, I'm not going to do it. If it is starting to sound really bad then I might as I'm going but if I start to write something I usually get a bit obsessed with it to the point where I can spend 10 hours a day sitting at the computer doing that. But if I wake up and I'm like 'I don't want to do this today' then I won't because one of the things that I learned is when it is there, it is there. When it is not there you can't just sit at the computer and dedicate an hour, two hours or whatever crazy thing. For me? If it's there, then its' there, and it is going to be written. I could spend a week just typing, waking up in the middle of the night and write a note. Drive down the road and have to pull over to get a pen and write about what I'm thinking about like 'ah hah, right that is it!' So you know, I write often and it is a constant process until it gets done…Everyone has their own style and that is what works for me (Author 12).

Authors demonstrated a few reasons for why writing speed is variable. For example, as one author notes, the off and on process of writing speed can often be a result of the groundwork done prior to writing:

> Sometimes I struggle. It may take me an hour to write a paragraph and sometimes it just flows. I do find that one thing that helps me out a lot is setting up an outline, organizing it. Once I set up an outline of what I want to say

> then it happens really quickly. If I don't have an outline I struggle. I think that is part of the flow, a big part of flow is organization and knowing what you want to say…Once the organization is there and I feel good about the organization, everything else seems to fall into place…and the organization doesn't always come automatically, sometimes it takes a while. You have to think about it, you have to leave it alone for a little while and come back to it because I'm not feeling really good about where I am…until that organization is there…it may take me a couple days to figure it out (Author 23).

The previous author suggests that if one produces a solid footing through groundwork writing speed is facilitated in the future.

Another reason some scholars identified variable writing speed involves the type or complexity of a paper. It may be the case that a familiar subject matter is quickly written as where an alternative subject matter necessitates more consideration:

> I think that it is that I have gotten better over time. I can write a publishable piece typically in 3 days…Once I have the analysis set and once I have it all—can I do it for every paper? No. But I have done it several times before. Do I always? No. But there are other papers that I cannot do that with it takes a lot more time and a lot more finesse…I think that sometimes it is just the complexity of the issue. Some things you know a lot about if you have been working in an area, you know of all the research literature, you know what the structure is. You have it sort of figured out in your head. Other papers are a bit more challenging along those lines. Especially when you start writing in different areas. New areas it takes a lot to learn all of the good papers and it takes a lot to learn the flow of evidence and so forth (Author 15).

Additionally, the pacing or speed of writing an article can be interwoven with a process of coauthorship. That is, when a scholar works with coauthors they rely on others to produce a draft. As the following author suggests, working with coauthors is often part of the career stage of being a full professor. For example, in situations in which

accomplished professor's work with and train doctoral students writing may progress more slowly on those projects:

> I mean I don't just sit down and knock out a whole draft or anything. I think everything I do now is with co-authors, it's kind of a career stage thing. I have big projects and lots of students and former students but you know in effect I've sort of worked at not getting too caught up in crafting every sentence until there's a whole draft because I've often enough had the experience of 'well I took a lot of time writing that sentence and now I see that I didn't even need it so that was a waste of time.' So you know, I try to hold myself back from fussing too much about too small a level (Author 18).

This section has illustrated that drafting speed is less about writing quickness or the speed with which one can make revisions, but more about taking the opportunities in blocks of time to write when inspiration hits. Like the following author, scholars regularly noted that although they may be slow at producing a finished manuscript, that most of their time was tied up in revisions rather than an initial draft: "Probably more towards the slow side. I mean the initial draft might come out very quickly but the process to revise may take an extended period of time" (Author 16). In that same vein, authors emphasized the importance of getting down the first draft regardless of quality:

> I would rather get it out as I am writing and try to go back and fix things….I feel like you could really—and I have done that, I have spent an hour like 'is that the right word?' And that can get really debilitating and I like the feeling of making progress. So I think that making progress is beneficial and you can always go back and make something better…So for me at least, I can struggle from sentence to sentence, so I will probably go back and fix it again, so don't waste a whole hour doing it now (Author 4).

As the previous author notes, writing paralysis is a symptom of attempting to produce a perfect first draft. That is, authors seemed to corroborate Lamott's (1995) sentiment about

"shitty first drafts": "…the idea of shitty first drafts. All good writers write them. This is how they end up with good second drafts and terrific third drafts." An important aspect of drafting speedily is the willingness to write imperfect first drafts, and then, return to them many times as necessary with layers of revisions:

> I don't painstakingly hold onto letters and phrases, and wordsmith it to death. I just get it out there on paper, and then, edit and flush it out as needed. Definitely, have to get pen to paper, you could sit and spin your wheels forever but nothing is written until you get words on the document and go from there (Author 26).

Although the clarity and presentation of academic articles that land in premier journal outlets often feels to be a result of effortless word-smithing to the audience, conversations reveal that in truth accomplished scholars often endure a process of writing imperfect first drafts and then going through long stages of revisions:

> I get it all down and I go back and really thoroughly try to go paragraph by paragraph and try to think about those paragraphs, you know, each paragraph really needs to say something. And so, if I'm not conveying something in a paragraph or if I can convey it in a sentence that is when I start cutting and editing things down. I don't worry about that as much on the first go, I just try to get it down and then clean it up afterwards (Author 13).

In line with the original hypothesis of this section, in which it was imagined that the most productive scholars have learned adept writing speeds that can be conjured at any time to write perfect drafts, it seemed straightforward that productive authors would only need a draft or two in order to construct a publishable piece. However, as authors suggested drafting often resulted in constructing a quick first draft and then engaging in many layers of revisions. Although numbers were widely disparate, nearly all of the

scholars indicated that they engage in constructing revised drafts of their paper. These numbers ranged from a couple drafts to upwards of one hundred separate drafts.

> A lot of drafts? No. But I think that's a function of the piecing it together approach. Once a complete draft is ready thing probably go through, for my work or with colleagues, no more than two revisions… And by revisions with my colleagues, I mean, I make a pass, then you make a pass, and that's one… one real round of revisions and one look for the stupid shit (Author 11).

The previous author places the need to produce minimal drafts as a byproduct of the outline approach to writing. That is, scholars that only produced a couple drafts of a manuscript often did so because they produced many drafts of an outline and or spent a considerable amount of time introducing sentences or paragraphs into a single draft. Similarly, to the approaches to getting started section—where scholars differed in getting started through using from the head or from the heart approach—drafting numbers seemed to be somewhat reliant on one's approach:

> And I know these waves of reading or trying to get the background or make it into context, and then writing and then reading and then writing, and so I will sometimes spend a day writing just a page or two in a paper and it will be very polished. Other times, I will spend a day and I will write 10-12 pages and I will need to go in and clean some things up but it is still there, quite polished and if I write that much it is because I had a lot of it in mind and I knew exactly where it was going to go. So in terms of a draft, once I have a full draft of a paper it's just a few versions away from being ready to submit at that point (Author 1).

These style differences of saving, restructuring and how they store and recognize drafts had implications towards the number of drafts they provided. For example, some scholars identified a considerable number of drafts in the process of producing a publishable

piece. These authors often produced a newly saved file for individual changes and small structural changes:

> Well okay, one thing that I might mention is that my first draft might just be, you know, a paragraph or an introduction. Or maybe it will be methods. So, what I consider a draft is definitely not a full draft when I tell you this number, but when I say the number is probably between 50 and 75…But that is because I am working very incrementally and most of my work is collaborative. I'm also sending it to coworkers and they are also going to be drafting and editing so it's a lot of versions…but that is not always, you know, it might just be 30 drafts but I have papers that have had over 75 for sure (Author 4).

In turn, the journal outlet review process often accounts for numerous drafts in the culmination of a published piece. Often draft numbers are considerably increased after one sends a piece out for review. If the paper goes through numerous rounds of revision and resubmission, then the number of drafts can increase substantially. Thus, the preference of one's journal outlets may have a considerable effect on the number of drafts. That is, outlets that conventionally require many alterations or changes to manuscript submission can increase the number of drafts, whereas outlets that systematically require fewer changes have a smaller impact on the number of drafts:

> It depends on the complexity of the article. I usually write 4 or 5 drafts. So where there is a lot of editing going on and I always number them so I know which one came before. Let's say I have a section in my literature review and I decide to cut it out, but I send it to a journal. One of the main critique is that I didn't cover this particular literature. Then I will be able to go back to an earlier version, grab that set of literature that I had already written and put it into the paper. The piece I had in Crim there were probably 10-15 versions if you count that there were 3 revisions from Criminology. It went through peer review twice and then producing the third one. It is always several, there is never a time I just sit down and write a paper without revisions (Author 30).

That is, commentary from external reviews at journal outlets inspire authors to make changes and produce new drafts. Particularly, high tier journal outlets may require a considerable range of content, organizational and stylistic changes that influence drafting numbers: "I'm slow and I go through draft to draft. Most of my papers that have been accepted have 40 to 70 drafts to them. Usually, I'll have 25 to 30 range when I send it out for review and then it's just draft after draft, send it back to the coauthors again and it's a long process" (Author 25).

Thus, this section has revealed two interesting characteristics of drafting among the most productive scholars. First, conversations reveal that accomplished scholars are, perhaps surprisingly, not able to call forth their inspiration but rather it appears intermittently. Second, even the most prolific authors regularly endure writing imperfect drafts and that good drafting comes in producing revised drafts. Thus, a paramount underpinning of productive drafting exists at an intersection in which an author is willing to take available opportunities in order to write imperfectly. However, those who drafted less than others were often offset by their outline-based approach, where numerous outlines set the stage for a mature draft. To this point, we have investigated approaches to getting started on a manuscript, productivity and the use of time, and drafting speeds. The following section investigates how authorship works in criminology.

Approaches to Authorship

Although approaches to writing, such as getting started and distributing time, are central tasks to developing a manuscript, literate tasks such as deciding authorship are also important practices surrounding writing and publishing in criminology. To this point,

there has been relatively minimal research devoted to understanding authorship in criminology. Generally, research on authorship in criminology has focused on the number of authors that share ownership over a paper. Whereas in the 1970s and 1980s solo-authorship was common, it is increasingly becoming a rare form of producing publications (Fisher et al., 1998; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2011). Research teams and advancing technologies have resulted in multi-authored papers, in which the average author per paper in criminology has increased from 1.28 in 1967 to 2.45 in 2007 (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2011). Although this suggests a shift in how criminological scholarship is conducted and evaluated, it also opens questions of deciding how researchers think about authorship rights and orders. The following section draws from interviews with the most influential scholars in order to address these questions and produce a base of understanding for how authorship is conceived in the field.

Contribution: "He who runs with it, owns it." For some of the scholars, authorship position should be entirely centered on one's contribution regardless of other characteristics. From this perspective contribution centered on a wide range of potential tasks:

> That kind of thing should always be decided in terms of contribution. It goes from everything from writing to data contribution. My stance is that everyone should do some writing. Whether you rewrite it or they rewrite it, everyone has to do some writing. Everyone has to sign off when they send out the manuscript. Everybody has to read the page proofs and everyone has to read the revision memo. Everyone has to be involved from the beginning to the end (Author 10).

The basis of contribution involved "active membership." That is, in order to qualify for authorship position, one must be involved at each stage of the process until the final culmination of the project:

> You have to be an active member. That doesn't mean you are even composing original writing. It means that they are reading and seeing development of the manuscript through review. And providing feedback even if it is just in the margins of a manuscript. You have to approve of it, you have to contribute to it. It's not there just to put my name on it…you have to be part of the team even if it is just writing data and revising (Author 10).

Interestingly, scholars often identified contribution in a sense of writing rather than other stages of the research process. Establishing active membership often meant being involved at every stage of the writing process of which results in a manuscript (i.e. writing, revision, submission, etc.). "But I would say as a general rule they should be doing more than just adding data. They should at least be involved with the writing" (Author 23). For strict proponents of contribution-based patterning on authorship right and order, active membership was central regardless of who constructed the idea or who supplied the data.

However, in contrast to the strict contribution perspective, some scholars questioned what counts as a contribution: "In order to be a coauthor, you have to intellectually contribute to the publication…it doesn't say what percentage—it could be 1 or 2% but it does say contribution" (Author 25). In terms of authorship right, contribution is a fuzzy concept that does not indicate what amount one should contribute in order to be included as an author. Perhaps, more problematic, is that the amount of work one puts into a manuscript does not always equate neatly with the weight of one's intellectual contribution. Thus, it is possible for a scholar to put a considerable amount of time into a

project and make a small intellectual contribution, and vice versa: "I could never put a number of hours on a paper and equate it with authorship. I have spent hundreds of hours on an article and been 8th. I've spent 10 hours on an article and been first" (Author 26). And even more problematic, how should a contribution perspective come to terms with attributing different intellectual values to sections or tasks accomplished in the process of constructing a manuscript:

> Let's say I have the idea and I write the introduction, but you do everything else: you get the data, crunch the data, make up the tables, write up the method section, write up the conclusion. All of this stuff. At the end your probably put in 2 or 3 times as many hours as I did. Well, who should be first author? How did you decide that? Is it the ownership of the idea? Is it who does the most work? Those things are unclear" (Author 29).

Although contribution-based, active membership ordering was the most common perspective, many authors pointed to underlying problems with using contribution as a sole indicator of intellectual contribution. Thus, many authors utilized other indicators of right and order for authorship.

The big idea. After the commonplace consensus that active membership was best practice, some author's suggested the idea was integral to authorship right: "I think if it is your idea then you should be on the project. [*Well what if you do nothing and you just had the idea, is that enough to be on the paper?*] Well then somebody stole your idea" (Author 4). Strikingly blunt, the previous author identifies that if the project is your idea than it is "your idea," or rather than you have ownership of it. Taken to a logical extreme, this suggests that if you are not the first author on a paper that is your idea than it has simply been wrestled from your grasp. Setting a strong precedent, the author suggests that the individual who produces the idea must be the rightful first author of the paper.

Some of the other scholars followed suit here, in which producing the idea was often believed to be an integral part of the research process, and thus, warranted a top authorship position: "I don't have problems with authorship, and mainly it's because I collaborate with lots of people and more than one time and generally speaking we always share. If it's my idea and my paper, I'm obviously first author. I'm not a big fan of party papers or paper where no one takes charge" (Author 14).

Basing authorship order and right on idea had a practical use in which it could be used to offset a failure of the paper's authors to engage in up-front conversation on order expectations. In these instances where authors did not discuss order upfront, scholars described that it was difficult to disentangle who did the most work on the process, and thus, they often resigned to relating order to whoever originally conceptualized the idea:

> When I am co-author and one of us has an idea we will call the other and say what do you think about this. We will say, "I like it" or "I don't like it," [or] "that is boring" and then we go back and forth until we get to the end of the paper. And I don't know who wrote more. Sometimes it will be my data and then we work enough and we are like "it doesn't matter." It is usually whose idea came first, that is who ends up being the first author (Author 3).

Yet deciding authorship on the basis of idea was not without controversy. Authors identified the difficulty delineating what counted as attributing an idea.

> If it is an idea this brings up issues with intellectual property…The question becomes what do you mean when you say that you contributed an idea? Is it a barroom discussion that you 2 or 3 days later think of something else, and then maybe that is a little different? And that actually brings up some interesting questions on intellectual property and what does it mean, how do we define where a new idea begins and where you own idea, that was sparked by something that someone else said (Author 1).

Some believed that one had to surpass simply providing an idea and make an intellectual contribution to the paper: "It should always be centered on contribution…Just because I came up with it [the idea], it doesn't mean that I will end up being the lead author. I ended up being last author of that piece because everyone else did more work than me on the whole thing…Idea alone? No. You have to contribute in some significant way, in some aspect of the paper" (Author 6). Thus, some authors identified the ways that having the idea and contribution can intersect to inform authorship order.

Although idea is seen as important, a contribution perspective suggested that ideas can evolve and alter throughout the writing process. Whereas an original idea is certainly seen as important, writing during the research process is a collaborative effort that results in a product that becomes more than the sum of its parts:

> To me though, research is really collaborative, I mean I am not going to fuck someone out of authorship or try to steal an idea and say it's mine. That is just not my style. I want to be able to hold my head high and know this is a good paper because of all of us…if someone contributes in a way that makes that paper what it is today then that are an author on it. If you took them out of the equation and the paper is exactly the same as it is now then they are not an author (Author 2).

Although conceiving the idea seemed to be enough to have authorship right, a more complex vision of authorship positioning was proffered by scholars. Scholars put forth a concept of constructing an idea through contribution; that is, as authors work together, dialogue and conceptualize the framework of the idea it morphs into something else entirely: "The idea is owned not by the person who says 'aha, I got an idea' necessarily. But the idea is who really runs with it and leads the outlining, conceptualizing of the idea" (Author 11).

Ownership of data. Like the other characteristics, the ownership of data was a considerable point of disagreement. On one hand, proponents of data ownership as a basis for authorship decision-making indicated that data collection is an intellectual process that takes a considerable amount of time and energy. In contrast, proponents of contribution indicated that basing authorship right and order upon data ownership could create an authorship imbalance in the field; in which dataset owners could potentially claim authorship right to any piece from a public dataset. Overall, however many scholars indicated the fundamental importance of constructing large datasets to the field of criminology, the immense financial and time-consuming cost of collecting them, and the overall lack of incentive to do so:

> Yeah, I actually in some cases I think so and this might be the part of me that has been exposed to the hard science approach especially over the last few years. Sometimes in the hard science, especially in like genetics research, in some cases it takes years and hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of dollars, to collect data and then that data becomes a huge resource. That person who collected it or that group that collected could never tap all of it. And so I actually have no problem with that with someone who is in charge of collecting data then being the co-author on papers…I think in a very general sense to give a direct answer I think that yes, that certainly [is] enough to warrant a contribution identification as a co-author on a paper (Author 1).

Although the contribution perspective identifies that ownership of data must often be combined with the amount of work directly related to the project, proponents of data ownership suggested that producing a dataset was a contribution in itself. Proponents of data ownership are able to frame the immense time and energy devotion of data collection as a significant intellectual contribution to the final product: "Yeah that [data topic] is another thing that comes up. Generally, when someone brings the data I think

that they deserve something. I offer to include them as a coauthor and kind of give them the opportunity to contribute and I think they deserve that opportunity. Because the data is very important even if it is something that they already have, it's a contribution" (Author 14). Thus, they see contribution as occupying a range of tasks that does not always fall directly within the writing that occurs on the pages of the manuscript and instead, identify contribution as a time and energy-based phenomenon:

> Personally, I don't think so [ownership of data for authorship]. Well, not to be first author. I think it depends, you have some of these studies where people have contributed massive amounts of time and energy, in some instances, their whole career and I think if they want to be on that paper that is using their data I think that should be considered, because that data would not exist if it weren't for their efforts (Author 8).

Contrasting the contribution proponents that identify *active* membership as necessary for authorship right and order, one may conceptualize data ownership as a sort of *fixed* membership; where an individual's time and effort are not separable from the culmination of the final product.

Others were less conflicted between the two perspectives and rather presented them as one. These scholars identified that authorship right and order should be designated by contribution and the ownership of data together: "Typically, with other co-authors, it will be based on amount of contribution, as well as ownership of the data. If you bring the data to me and ask me to work with you, you're lead. So it goes that way. And that applies with student work. When it's your work, it's your work, not mine" (Author 11). However, the mixed narrative between contribution and data was a murky topic:

> You know collecting data, it's a big thing, it's a ton of work and presumably, there's a whole lot of thinking that went in the data being collected. There are big data sets that can be collected and can be good for a ton of purposes and I don't think those people should have their name on everything. Well it would be sort of silly, you know, it's like [National Survey], you know there have been about five hundred articles that came out of that, he doesn't even know about a third of them, so what's he want his name on them for. You know, he should get credit, a footnote or whatever, for the data and all of that. He wrote plenty of stuff on his own, I'm sure he's quite happy about it so… (Author 18).

As the author notes, data collection is seen as a considerable amount of work and in some cases should play a part in designating authorship right and order. However, the contribution perspective suggests that without contribution to the paper as the baseline of evaluating right and position, a practice of authorship right and order based upon data ownership could be absurd. That is, authors of commonly used datasets would have authorship right to a vast array of papers throughout the field. A contribution mechanism provides a balance to this potential. Beyond time and effort, research questions of manuscripts are limited to the creative parameters of the data collection itself. In terms of fixed membership, it becomes uncertain as to whether one can separate the idea for the paper from the available items on the survey. To some extent, perhaps, those questions provide what data is collected and paper ideas that can potentially emerge.

Some contribution proponents suggested that data ownership was not enough to make one eligible for authorship order or right, made concessions by suggesting that data collectors should receive some type of benefit and recognition. A suggestion for data collectors involved a footnote or note that provides an acknowledgment of the contribution made by the data collector:

> Well, I guess it depends on the nature of the data. If the data is publicly available ICPSR you certainly want to acknowledge the people who conducted the study but I don't think there is any expectation that you should include them as authors. But if the data are not yet publicly available then the person who collected the data and made it available to you they will be included as coauthor even though their contribution to the study might be limited coding an asterisk next to the data, describing the data but it might not be much more beyond that. Often they are listed but typically their contribution is limited so they are listed as the last author (Author 16).

To each according to their need. Although the most popular philosophy identifying authorship right and order was contribution, the need of the author often provided an opportunity to circumvent this underpinned convention:

> The proper answer is who contributed the most to the project. Is that the reality of it? In my career, if the junior scholar, even if I think I have done more, it won't mean as much to you if you go second. You know as a Ph.D. student, a young assistant professor has more to gain from a first author that I do. Now if they didn't do anything but edit then that is unwarranted. I'm not trying to say that everything is fraudulent but a lot of the time it is hard to determine who really did more on a project (Author 3).

A general interpretation of authorship order suggests that since solo-authorship has become increasingly rare, one's position in authorship order has become of increased importance in evaluating one's scholarly production. Thus, many of the influential scholars discussed how one's promotional need can undermine the pure basis of contribution as the center of deciding authorship right and order: "I mean, you want to promote the interests of your students and so they'll be first or second, and I'll be third" (Author 15).

For many of the scholars in this project, who are of full professor status, the benefit of being first author on a paper is minimal and instead they often benevolently

pass it on to graduate students coming up in the field: "I don't care about that anymore [authorship order]…so if they ask me to do something I'll tell them I want to bring a graduate student on and they'll say ok, but you need to be first author. If not, I don't really care, I usually put their names first. That's probably not common with people, but I'm not that concerned about it" (Author 9). Thus, although generally, the field uses broad thematic characteristics (i.e. contribution, idea, data, etc.) to decide authorship, when graduate students are involved, authorship seems to be often based on how important it is to the career of the individual: "but for me it is a function of where you are at in your career and who you are working with if you are a graduate student, or if you are working with an assistant professor, I go under the assumption that I am not going to be the lead author" (Author 26).

Coauthors and upfront conversations. Beyond decision-making surrounding authorship right and order, accomplished authors noted the importance of choosing good coauthors. On an operational level, scholars indicated the importance of selecting good coauthors to avoid the conflicts that can be associated with a delicate topic like authorship. Specifically, some scholars indicated that authorship is not a topic they deal with because they have regular and routine coauthors in which they use the authorship practice of rotation: "because so many of mine are with [professor], we alternate. Straight up. Whether we do the title page last of a manuscript, its 'What is the authorship?' 'I don't know,' 'what's the last thing we finished,' 'look it up,' and you switch…we are a true partnership so we just rotate" (Author 11). Although just a few authors mentioned rotation-based authorship with regular coauthors, generally many of the scholars discussed the operational difficulties of working with new coauthors.

Specifically, scholars indicated the importance of discussing authorship right and order upfront before the majority of work had been completed: "Well first and foremost, whenever I collaborate with people we always decide that upfront. You have at least a good idea about who is going to do what" (Author 4). Authors suggested that an operational "up-front" conversation was important; in which a discussion with the research team should take place identifying the pattern in which authors would be positioned on the final product. The upfront conversation resulted in a set of expectations for the team in which authors were on the same page as far the amount of work each author was expected to contribute to the culmination of a final product.

> So I almost always will get the order of authorship out of the way before any or before much work is done. That way everyone is on the same page and everyone knows what to expect and what is expected of them. That becomes a lot easier when you have some serial co-authors that you work with quite frequently as I have in my career. So I have a few co-authors and colleagues who I know depending on whose idea it was and who pulls the most weight, I know how the coauthor order will shake out. For others, if it is a co-authorship it is just a very direct conversation about it. It's just like "Here is what I expect, is this in line with what you expect?" And if it is a new collaboration I will also often outline here is what my contribution would be, here is what I hope will be your contribution. Are we on the same page about these things. So I think it is important to be open about these things up front (Author 1).

However, as the previous author notes, the upfront conversation is often mitigated by the presence of "serial" co-authors. That is, authors that regularly write manuscripts together may already have knowledge of how authorship positions will be situated. Research teams that write together regularly are understood as having predetermined outlines of expectation, contribution and benefit. This is understood as a particularly important conversation to have with graduate students, as they are being initiated into the field.

Establishing a positive practice of having an up-front conversation is seen as a necessary operational process that graduate students should learn: "I always try to work that out in advance. I publish a lot with students. Students that I'm training and other faculty, and I always try to make it very, very clear that if you do more work that I do then you are first author" (Author 15).

A failure to outline expectations of authorship position can result in a messy process of delineating who worked the most after the product is completed. Having an early conversation deciding authorship position can be uncomfortable:

> So I think it works best when that gets sorted out before it's too far into things and so that person can really be taking that role throughout, rather than have a whole lot of people just kind of loosely fooling around with lots of parts and then deciding in the end, 'okay, who logged the most hours.' Because who knows and the process isn't going to work that well either and there's likely to be hurt feelings so I think it's really best if that is sorted pretty early so the person can have the most responsibility and input in the parts that matter which is kind of in the grand design of what we're trying to do and do it as well as in the writing" (Author 18).

Authors noted how conversations become unpleasant if a research team waits until after the product is completed. An upfront conversation helps evade conflicts between authors. As authors note, a failure to outline expectations of authorship and work contribution can result in hurt feelings and dissent among the research team:

> Never write a paper with somebody and then afterward decide who is going to be what author. In some fields, it doesn't necessarily matter, everybody goes alphabetical. But with ours it certainly does and so I always talk to my co-authors in advance. I always have a plan in advance, like "okay, you are first and I am second or if there is a third person." That way it helps people know what to expect and no get their feelings hurt and it helps people allocate their efforts (Author 7).

Nonetheless, scholars offered sentiments discussing the delicate nature of upfront conversations on authorship position and the even more unpleasant situations in which a failure to have them could lead to conflicts between research partners. This potential for conflict is why many scholars placed a high importance on picking coauthors and research teams: "I don't want there to be any ambiguity; and here's the problem and I tell this to my graduate students, when three people write an article they all think that they did 50% of the work" (Author 29). Scholars indicated that friends with different work styles must navigate delicate conversations on authorship order and that the best way to handle such a situation is to have conversations with new research partners and coauthors upfront: "Look a lot of friendships are broken up over articles and authorship, because they feel like of all the people my friend should not screw me over…My best advice to people is settle it upfront and If you have an ongoing relationship it will even out in the end…So it will work out in the long run where I take the lead on this you take the lead on that (Author 29).

Overall, scholars indicated a complicated view of authorship. Although conversations around authorship often have obvious concepts to decide right and order — such as contribution and idea—these interviews identify that these concepts are less straightforward than they appear initially. Interview conversations around each commonplace indicator of authorship offered issues with using them at face value. In tow with authorship, journal and outlet selection are literate practices that surround that process of writing and are integral parts of the publishing process. The following section investigates a typology of journal selection drawn from conversations with influential scholars.

Approaches to Journal Selection

Choosing an appropriate journal outlet is an often unrecognized skill. Journal outlets vary widely in their criteria of formatting, what counts as evidence or insight, and what constitutes good writing. As authors suggest, choosing the wrong journal can result in painful reviews and desk-rejection. It became clear that some scholars took pride in their ability to carefully and effectively select the correct outlet, whereas others admitted struggle:

> I am terrible at that! I rely on my colleagues more for looking for journals. Obviously the pecking order in journals, you want to send to the best journal you can. That is where it is going to be picked up and recognized, cited and contributes to policy. We do this all for a reason! Where will it get most visibility part of that is the quality of the journal, part of it is the substance view of the journals. We work not just in criminology related areas, Substance Abuse journals, Maltreatment places and so forth. I hate that question! (Author 36).

Beyond noting difficulties with the skill of selecting the appropriate journal outlet, the previous excerpt identifies the range of responses that scholars provided as to how they select their journals. Generally, suggestions involved concepts of "fit" and "tier." Fit often included a range of ways that a manuscript could fit the scope and aims of the journal. Tier included considerations of ranking, in which scholars adjusted the potential landing spot between rank and study limitations. Thus this section identifies the factors by which the most influential scholars select their journal outlets.

The goodness of fit. Generally, although the division was not always neat the concept of how well a manuscript fit with the aims and scopes of a journal was considered a primary factor in journal selection over tier, or the ranking of the journal. As the next author explains the two often intersect together; that is, the scholar identifies that

the ranking of outlet that an author may send their paper to can be mediated by the nature of the paper itself and that this should be the primary consideration:

> Well first of all usually I have an idea of where I'm going to send something as I'm writing it. Or I have one in mind while I'm writing but it doesn't mean that I will send it there. Sometimes I will send it, sometimes you know things change I hear the journal is not good, I hear the journal can be ambiguous at times, you know I hear something or maybe one of my coauthors can't wait a year for R&R because they are trying to get tenure or maybe I already have a couple of articles in it they don't need or I need a high-level publication or I can go with a lower deal and get it in and move on. So there are a lot of different factors with writing it's not just... So I always erred on the side of caution and send them to lower-tier journals just because I don't like that dance [of] starting at the top and working my way down. I haven't gotten much out of it except maybe a wounded self-esteem….Shoot for the journal that you think it has a good shot at (Author 10).

Most commonly, "fit" considered the extent to which one's topic situates with the aims, scope or formatting of a particular journal outlet: "Well it is a tough one. I think about the number one consideration is the topic what journals are going to be interested in my main independent or dependent variable…And also the impact on the journal" (Author 5). In other words, a primary selection factor considers whether the primary concepts or subjects the scholar is exploring are focal concerns of the journal outlet. For some of the prolific authors, selecting a journal by topic greatly influenced the ranking of their potential outlet:

> Um…frequently just a fit issue is what decides, especially when you do niche marginalized kinds of work that doesn't go in mainstream things. So I publish in a lot of specialty journals. For mainstream stuff it's seeing, making a judgment to how good you think your piece is and how high you should shoot; and knowing the expectations of journals at different levels. Being that I almost always collect my own data, my data is not considered "good

> enough," "big enough," for very top journals who want national samples…" (Author 11).

In this sense, the previous scholar identifies that since they engage in research around a topic that is not mainstream they are not able to submit articles to the highest tier ranking journal outlets, and thus, fit becomes the primary consideration.

Other scholars would attempt to aim to particular journals. Thus, "journal aiming" involved crafting a manuscript with a specific journal in mind. In this sense, as one would tailor a manuscript to the aims, scopes and formatting requirements of a journal throughout the writing process:

> …most of the time I will start I'll be aiming to craft this paper so that it can go to a criminology or a criminal justice journal. So you know as most of us do occasionally I know that the idea that I am working on would not be of interest to the typical CCJ journal so I know I will be crafting it for a different audience but for the most part it is writing for CCJ and so I don't usually then write it for a certain journal. In my experience when I have tried to write articles for a better chance of getting into a specific journal they don't get into that journal (Author 1).

When one crafts a manuscript for a specific journal they are doing so to write to a particular audience. Thus, a large part of journal aiming is being able to preselect the audience that will read the manuscript.

Journal aiming can act as a maneuver to mitigate the complexity of conflicting writing styles that cropped up among having numerous journal outlets with differing expectations: "One of the things I do when I am in the early writing stages, writing up a study, is I'll try to pick the journal first. Make sure that I am writing within their guidelines if they have a page limit, if they have a certain audience. I want to know that up front and not make that decision later on. Because it really does influence your

writing" (Author 28). As the author notes, the selection of the journal often contains not only assumptions of what concepts are important but differing styles of writing that are conventional to the outlet. In line with this study, authors recognize that a fundamental part of journal acceptance, and thus submission, falls within the writing style of the piece. If writing styles align with author and outlet, the manuscript has a greater chance of acceptance:

> I usually think about where I want to send a paper before I even write it…and again I publish for a lot of different journals. The way I write for Criminology journal would be very different than how I write for a psych journal which is different than how I write in say a genetics journal. And so some papers could go to any of them it just depends on how you want to frame them. So, in general,, I will think about it will this be a Crim type journal or a Psych Type journal and then I just that is more of how I think about it…But in many ways, I don't look at like I'm writing this for Crime and Delinquency or I'm writing this for this journal. It's more of 'okay this is more of a Crim, or a Psych or a Genetics Journal and they are all unique in their different ways.' And then you know just through experience I'll think well this kind of feels like this type of journal. Or this sort of feels like this type of journal and then send it off and you know look at the comments and modify from there (Author 2).

Indeed, it is not only that individual journals have different accounts of what writing styles are used or what is considered good writing but, as we have seen, different fields have alternate conceptions of good writing. As the previous passage reveals, the "framing" of a paper is often varied across fields and disciplines to the extent that authors must consider which general areas the manuscript will be sent. Indeed, the previous author also connects this experience of aligning types of writing styles to particular fields with a feeling. That is, journal selection skill is a culmination of experience, where one

musters a feeling of whether a particular style of writing is appropriate for an area of outlets or even specific outlets.

Beyond fit of topic and aiming to specific journals, authors identified that some simply had preferences for particular journals. Bluntly, an author may simply have a personal affinity for a journal because it effectively matches one's tastes: *"*One what is the paper about. That is you know that is probably one of the more determining factors; content, does it fit a certain journal? You know I do have my favorite journals like anyone – I have those that I read consistently and those that I don't. I have a, you know, I tell you working in the bio area now – working in the area with this kind of motivation" (Author 15). Although the author, like earlier excerpts, identifies that journal selection is often based upon fit of content, they also situate their fit within their favorite journals. Although matching tastes can certainly be a factor in journal selection, sometimes preference is more of an alignment of values than a cognitive selection of similar tastes. In other words, sometimes authors will simply find that their writing and topic matches well with the preferences of a journal and they will continue to submit manuscripts to the outlet:

> I don't have favorite journals – what I think is it is a matter of people end up developing a certain writing style and some style just work better in certain journals. And those styles not only fit better in certain journals but they fit certain editors and it goes on to what fits those certain editors go into those journals. Now, I try my best in order to take the objectives to move with what I have cited to guide me to the best journal to send it to (Author 20).

The trail of tiers. Although the fit was the primary factor in journal selection offered by scholars, the second characteristic of tier often came into play. Tier involved considering the ranking of the journal as a central factor in outlet selection: "So, it's got

to be above a certain quality and it's got to have an impact factor most of the time, it's not always true because I've written for other stuff, but if it's got an impact factor that certainly helps" (Author 33). In other words, scholars considered the highest possible journal outlet relevant to the paper as an appropriate starting point: "Nowadays my decisions are based on what is the topic of the paper and who accepts these types of papers. And then what is the best journal that we would have a shot at – and that is where I usually go first even if it is a long shot…I try to go the highest possible journal that this would not be embarrassing to send to" (Author 3).

Although fit of topic still maintained a premier spot when considering to which outlet a manuscript should be sent, the decision was often conditioned by tier. Thus, it was not only whether the article fit, but involved more of a balance between the fit of content and the highest possible ranking outlet:

> At this stage, it is mainly really about fit and with all of them I try to identify you know, how big of a contribution the article is likely to make…And also you might be like 'oh I have a small sample that is not generalizable past [a state],' for instance. That is not going to get published in Criminology so even though that fit might be right it might not be the right home for it...You know if I have grad students on the papers, which I almost do, I try to be mindful of them as in how long will it take in review… I think if your article could possibly go there then yeah why not send it to the best possible journal in for the fit; and I think that is not a bad strategy but I think that if you know you are not tenured or you are going up for a promotion or whatever the case may be, I think that you should think about the likelihood of your article being accepted somewhere… (Author 4).

Thus, the highest possible ranking is seen as promoting the highest level of benefit from the scholars involved; particularly, if any of the scholars on the manuscript is going for promotion or needs a higher ranked publication for the job market. Journal outlets with

high impact factors and elevated rankings carry extra weight for those in line for a promotion or the job market.

Although benefit from the rank of the journal outlet was an important factor of journal selection, the interest in tier for accomplished scholars was also heavily couched in visibility. That is, scholars were interested in procuring the largest potential readership for their paper:

> So then what I will the do I will write it for how I want it to be written and how I think it will best make the case and how it best gets my point across and then after that I'll try and have an honest assessment in where I think it might have the best chance of being published and then balancing that with the best chance of being published at the highest – the most visible place – so whether that be Criminology or Justice Quarterly or whatever it is. And then deciding of these options which are the best option for this paper (Author 1).

Thus, in staying true to tier, authors often explained selection through the visibility facilitated by the ranking of the journal: "…but if you had a chance in getting something published in *Science* or *Nature* or *Psy Science* or maybe MAPH with your study – then why not send it there? I mean *Science* – Millions of people read it all over the world. I don't think that the same thing could be said about our journal *Criminology"* (Author 8). Scholars identified circumstances where the visibility produced by the journal outlet was a primary determinant of where they would send their article.

However, visibility of one's paper was often more complicated when considered with the type of audience one wished to reach. For example, author's indicated a balance between the visibility of premier journals across the sciences generally and flagship journals in one's relative field:

> …but the thing is if you send this article to Science a lot of people will read or it or have access to it; where are the people who you are most interested in finding it in your field? So, you know, I think a publication in Science and having the impact score that it does is great, I mean you can get instant respect in the hard sciences to say I have published in Science; and not all findings are suited for that it has to be sexy or catchy and maybe controversial that could land at a place like that. So what I try to do in our discipline if I say okay this is a criminology study and I am not going to try to publish in a different discipline journal I think okay well what is the highest out of the top eight journals that I think it could potentially land I will submit to one of those and try to keep in within those eight (Author 8).

As the author notes, selecting a journal purely by ranking and impact score may result in a larger readership overall but also potentially result in a lower proportion of the intended audience. Likewise, the same is true when considering individual journal outlets within one's relative field. For example, a high ranked general interest journal may not be as effective as a lower ranked journal specific to the topic:

> So I also know [that] with JQ and other things is that ranks goes up you need a bigger focus better data collection and better writing. But there are a lot of good journals cause I'll tell you if you want to make the biggest impact on people in the field of corrections institution or field, is Federal Probation. It gets read a lot: practitioners and academics. Public quarterly management is read by a lot of academics and public managers. It does and it should influence your writing because if you're aiming more for, I want to send a corrections compendium, which is that academic journal for the American corrections associations, it's also heavily read my wardens and deputy wardens (Author 25).

The concern with audience highlights the balancing between fit and tier that often take place when deciding that a specific journal is the right outlet. Within this balance where fit and tier are constantly at play, an author must make a judgment on the worth of

their article. Tier, of how highly ranked of an outlet a scholar will send their manuscript to, is heavily based on how they value their work:

> …all of us are hoping to enhance visibility so all other things equal we would like to put our work in outlets that reach as many people that are likely to be interested in it and then another very practical consideration is realism; you know, how to make an assessment of how high is the quality of the piece. I mean I know myself not every at bat is a home run but that doesn't mean a double isn't useful production. And you know different journals have different acceptance rates we all know that if we've been around a while…It's just kind of silly to send something that you think is a modest but genuine contribution to a journal where you're pretty certain it's not going to be accepted and for good reason, maybe it doesn't have a significant impact as some other piece. So that's something I think of (Author 17).

If an author judges that their work is of great value, focusing on the contribution the study makes in the field, the work is then waged on the balance of fit and tier. In tow, scholars evaluate perceived interest in the piece as a contribution to the field. That is, before submission the author considers how interesting the question and findings are and whether a bigger audience would be intrigued by them: "My preference has always been a general interest rather than being a specific, so you know, I have done some policing research, I have a policing paper now and it got rejected from a general interest journal. I think it could still make it in a general interest journal because I think it has a broader appeal that just policing people if you are likely to get a broader audience there" (Author 19). Thus, an important step of in evaluating the tier in which one can send their manuscript comes in making a judgment as to the overall contribution of the piece and the general versus specific interest of the question and findings.

Judging the value of a manuscript. Overall, scholars identified that a tricky balance between fit and tier goes into the decision-making process behind journal selection. However, in the course of these discussions, an interesting conversation sprouted that started to disentangle a central assumption of these selection factors; that is, what makes one journal article better than another? Outside of which audience scholars wished to speak to, the fit was often mediated through a discussion of the tier, or rather, the highest possible shot for success. From a perspective of personal benefit, this makes considerable sense. Higher ranked journals offer more benefit for promotion and carry more weight on the job market for upcoming scholars. Additionally, they facilitate the highest level of visibility for accomplished authors. Even in considering one's specific audience, it is debatable as to whether a focused, lower ranked outlet will reach more or less of its intended audience than the most premier journals. So the questions arose: why would a scholar not always abide purely by the tier selection factor? Surely authors always considered their articles to be of consistently high value. Put another way, why would a scholar not submit every article they write to the highest ranked journal?

As discussed in the earlier sections—such as blocks of time and drafting—time is a valuable resource for scholars as inspiration and writing fluency tend to randomly appear and fade away. Thus, the commonplace answer as to why tier must be tempered by other factors involved the efficient use of one's time. Put differently, sending each piece to a top tier journal was seen as a waste of time for scholars where productivity is vital to academic success. As the following scholar notes, top-tier journals have high rejection rates and are difficult outlets in which one can achieve acceptance: "I would put journal publishing this way: most articles have no chance of getting into a top-tier

journal" (Author 29). The difficulty of getting one's paper into a top-tier journal necessitates an effective evaluation of the value of the paper mixed with perceiving time as a valuable resource for academics, placed increased importance on accurately judging the value of one's manuscript. For many, this came in two primary ways: through the robustness of the methodology or novelty of the study.

Throughout discussions on the value of a manuscript, a commonplace evaluation tool involved identifying the value of the methodology. Without a particular methodological level, many authors deemed sending a paper to a top-tier outlet as a waste of time:

> I think the Methods are critical…I think it has to be a topic that has to be relevant to today's criminological field. Like what I was saying, I often times don't send to the big journals in our field because I look at what I am studying and I am like 'well I have cross-sectional data and I just know that is not going to get published.' You know what I mean? I know the limitation of what I am studying. I think that it has a good topic I think that there is a good story in what I am studying but I know that they are going to come back and say 'this is cross-sectional data.' So why would I send it there… (Author 4).

As the previous authors note, one should go through a process of evaluating the value of the piece to identify whether it effectively meets the standards of a high-tier outlet. The author locates this evaluation process within the methodological design within a paper. In this circumstance, the author suggests that if one's methods are elite then the article has a greater chance to succeed. That type of introspective evaluation is paramount to assess the value of the piece and whether it may be sent to a high-level outlet.

Generally, authors also considered the amount of time a paper could be tied up within the peer review cycle. By sending a paper to a top-tier outlet with little chance of

success, the author could effectively handcuff their paper in a lengthy review cycle. A central aspect of wasting time involved the combination of lengthy review processes and the low success rates at top-tier outlets: "but it is just the length of time it takes to get reviews back and the amount of time it takes before your paper comes out" (Author 8). The importance of avoiding wasting time was exacerbated when the upcoming scholars, or scholars up for promotion, were involved in the process. Experiences with top-tier outlets, where the peer review process was lengthy, influenced one to not send a manuscript to a top-tier outlet unless they were certain about its value:

> I mean I have had experiences where you wait 1 or 2 years for something to come out and when that happens you are less inclined – almost deterred from submitting to that place unless there is a different editor. These are just some different factors that have come into play and have come into play more the longer that I am in the discipline. You know for students – Ph.D. students they want to submit papers and stuff but they need to be mentored in how and in which journals given the findings and I think that these types of things that I am talking about come with time and they should be passed down to the Ph.D. students (Author 8).

Thus, many authors identified that they would not send every piece to a top-tier outlet because each piece has a different value and tying their manuscript into a lengthy review process in which it faces almost certain rejection was a waste of valuable productivity time.

The primary process by which authors evaluated their own work was through the novelty of the idea or question:

> Sometimes it is about the arguments or the style of writing. More often than not though it is about the novelty of the idea; or the novelty of an approach to an idea. So it doesn't have to be that you are coming up with a brand new theory every time, in fact, I'd say that is not a good way to

> approach it but to pull out a novel hypothesis or to view an old hypothesis in a novel perspective—in a novel light. To come at it from a slightly different angle. Whether that be a slightly different methodological angle or even a slightly different interpretation of a theory or hypothesis and I think that is where that creativity aspect comes in too, we are not beholden to the exact language that the original theorists used. At some point, you as the reader interpret something that the theorist does [not] and that is the novelty of it. This is a slightly different take on something old hat (Author 1).

Novelty is an evaluation that one does relative to the existing literature on a topic. That is, the baseline of assessing the novelty of one's piece is by knowing whether the current study fills a gap in the knowledge on a topic or advances current theoretical information on the subject. Novelty, then, involved creativity as well as using a new lens to see old problems or even having a question that could garner widespread interest.

Seeing an old problem or explanation of a problem in a new light often meant forging a new path. For many scholars, novelty meant asking new questions rather than repeating already asked questions. Put differently, high-quality pieces were seen as not providing replication or repeating similar studies. An important aspect of evaluating the quality of one's piece came in its difference from other studies previously done in the field and on the topic:

> …I mean one of the tenants of sciences is replication and we have moved away from that in criminology and the social sciences in general and we see the replication crisis that is going on in Psych. If it is going on in psych I can guarantee it is going on in Crim...I have submitted a paper to the current editors of Criminology once and they said that this is a solid paper but it is a replication. They don't publish replication studies; they only publish groundbreaking results, so that is why I said maybe groundbreaking is wrong. I saw it as making unique contributions as well as corroborating what had been done previously as well as that is why I submitted it there" (Author 2).

In turn, investigating hot topic issues in criminal justice is an effective way to ensure the novelty of one's paper. Since novelty involves not only creativity but the extent to which the question garners widespread interest, controversial topics or areas were seen as novel. That is, if the issue is currently a controversial topic among the public or a polemical political issue, the author can judge the value of their piece highly:

> It's usually novelty or importance or the actual uniqueness or impact of the finding. So it could be a really large effect, it could be a really unique set of findings, novel findings, or finding that I might think to be more important to the readership. Another thing is hot topics…Some things just have more influence with culture in general and you might find it just pertains to something being talked about in the media and editors will be more welcoming to that topic at that given time" (Author 14).

Outside of evaluating the novelty of the study and the question, authors identified that the methodology was a primary way by which authors could value their paper and the appropriate tier of outlet:

> You need two things to get into a top-tier journal: you need an idea, preferably a big idea, and you need big data or high-quality data. If you don't have big data or high-quality data, and you don't have a high-quality idea that is important than you are going to get rejected. They're going to be like, 'That is a great idea, but your data sucks.' Or you'll have 'The data is okay but this is an idea that is more suited to specialty journals'… But having said that in order to get into a big journal you have to have superior data to get in a top journal or it is not happening… if you don't have longitudinal data it is very hard to get published (Author 29).

As the author notes, the primary identification of the value of the piece through methods involves the size of the data. Often meaning big, longitudinal datasets provide potentially more powerful analyses for topics, and hence, elevates the worth of the paper.

High-quality datasets are also indicative of the quality of the measures. As one author notes, high quality of measures are often difficult to attain because national datasets are rarely collected for research purposes in mind: "You know, and that is why people turn to these National Data Sets these National Secondary Datasets, but the problem with secondary datasets is that they usually don't measure things well because they were not designed for that purpose…" (Author 29). Thus, a central way that many authors evaluate the quality of their article is on the effectiveness of the measure used for their variables:

> The main issue would be how well have I been able to conduct my study in terms of do I have really valid and reliable measures with my dependent and independent variables…because typically I use other people's data and typically you know there is going to be some problems and my measures aren't as good as they could be and so in those cases where I have either a fatal flaw or perhaps just some significant flaws I know that a top journal is not going to have me. I have to lower it down. But if I have some pretty good measures especially compared to you know what others have used and I have a pretty important research question then I would shoot for a top journal… (Author 5).

Overall, accomplished scholars indicated that they select journal outlets through a balance between the concepts of fit and tier. Largely, these two factors indicated the value of one's manuscript and the audience with which the author wished to communicate. For example, although authors wished to convey research to a large audience, they also had to weigh the type of audience to which they were speaking. That is, would directly targeting a lower ranked journal, seen as the appropriate population, be more effective than a high tier outlet that reached a wide general population? Authors also identified a need to judge the value of one's manuscript when sending it out for

review at an outlet, which was largely attributed to the novelty of the question and the type of methodology (i.e. type of data set or sophistication of analysis).

Conclusion

This chapter has investigated the commonplace literate practices drawn from conversations with accomplished scholars. Overall, this section provides a counter-narrative to typical notions of writing in the social sciences from a universal perspective. Among these widespread practices in criminological writing—*Getting Started, Blocks of Time, Drafting, Authorship,* and *Journal Selection*—authors indicated similar banner term concepts but offered an array of differing viewpoints and perspectives on how they work. In line with the narrative of this project, these widespread practices are often taken as sustaining consensus on their praxis. This is evident by the extent to which conversations on *Getting Started* revolved around the heart and the head; or the extent to which authorship conversations revolved around a few primary factors; and how outlet selection factors were situated around fit and tier.

While much of these basic factors were widespread, authors also demonstrated widely varying definitions and beliefs of the underlying working cogs and mechanisms. Take *Getting Started* for example; authors generally agreed that beginning the writing of a manuscript could happen through thinking by writing (from the heart) or thinking and then writing (from the head). However, these ideas manifested differently across scholars where a "from the heart" approach could be chaotic, exist in the introduction, be found in the title and so on. Likewise, "a from the head" approach could be perceived as structuring paragraphs, building a house, or producing a PowerPoint for an audience, Generally, these differences were rather benign but, at times, these diverse perspectives

conflicted with or unraveled the perceptions of other authors. For example, in the *Authorship* section proponents of owning the idea or the data existed in contrast to proponents of contribution. Even within contribution, there was considerable disagreement on which pieces of a manuscript were differentially weighted. In other words, what is worth more: is the analysis worth more or the writing: the literature review or the discussion; the data collection or the conceptual framework?

A universal perspective would suggest that writing practices are static procedures that upcoming authors may mimic. Yet, in contrast to a universal perspective, these findings offer a counter-narrative to conventional writing wisdom in criminology that good practices are fixed across boundaries. In line with a socio-cultural theoretical perspective on writing, authors have diverse experiences and backgrounds, which in part help frame the truth about writing practices differently. It is not only important that authors do practices differently, but that they perceive the truths underlying practices differentially. For example, it is not only relevant that some authors identify authorship through contribution while others use data ownership, but that there are fundamental philosophical differences on these items. For instance, is data ownership contribution or is it not? How, and at what point, is formulating the big idea separate from contribution, or are they the same thing? At what point are these practices, and their underlying values, simply broad terms that we say but of which there is no true agreement—even among those that use them similarly? The following section investigates the conceptual side of these practices. That is, the next section explores the underlying conceptual values of writing in criminology.

CHAPTER 6: WHAT IS GOOD WRITING IN CRIMINOLOGY?

A central purpose of this study is to ascertain a glimpse of what the most influential criminology scholars believe are the qualities of "good writing" endemic to criminological culture. In turn, the findings from this study can lend insight into what writing qualities new scholars are supposed to mimic, and paradoxically, which writing practices are moving targets that are impossible to emulate. Couching this study within a writing studies lens, literate practices are interactional and culturally-embedded within discourse communities. This leads to producing different conceptions of what counts as effective literate work across fields and disciplines. Put simply, good writing practice in one field is not necessarily good practice in another. Thus, this section provides an investigation of this tension at work by extracting the central thematic core principles of writing divulged by the most influential scholars in the field. Indeed, the tension drawn from interviews is representative of the "writing game" within criminology (Casanave, 2002), where the rules of good writing are a mix of the discipline, sub-disciplinary, and the individual (Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006).

The core tenet of the universal framework suggested in this project is the traveling and fixed nature of writing practices and values in academics. That is, the universal framework suggests that good writing practices and values are similar across disciplinary boundaries and across individuals. Yet socio-cultural theoretical perspectives on writing have demonstrated the presence of discourse communities and the manner in which those communities negotiate and construct practices differently. Likewise, since from a socio-

cultural viewpoint writing is not fixed but negotiated then the values in one community of authors should be distinct from another community of writers. Thus, it is pertinent to understand writing values specific to criminology in order to better understand its fundamental workings.

Although this sentiment was not a direct question throughout the course of interviews, transcripts demonstrate that among the most influential criminological scholars the idea that writing shifts depending on the field or subject was not a widespread consensus. Superficially, scholars offered the sentiment that good writing exists objectively as a purely technical language (see windowpane theory; Miller, 1989), which is undergirded by a common belief that writing is the same across disciplines and that good writing travels. In line with a universal perspective, a portion of the authors testified that there is no difference between types of technical writing across fields: "I see most social science writing as the same. Across the social sciences, I don't think there is much different, in large part, for what's good writing and not good writing" (Author 11). Furthermore, authors suggested from a universal perspective that good technical writing is underlined by a consistent set of writing basics and that writing skills in criminology are honed by reaching back to grade school basics:

> It really is basic writing skills—grammar matters—subject and predicate match, singular with singular. Not misusing apostrophes and things like that, that you wouldn't expect to see in professional writing but sometimes people are careless. They don't proofread as they should and that's not good. That's an important part of writing that's just what we should have learned in English class back in high school or middle school. Those are the basics, then good writing should be crisp (Author 17).

This perspective implores that writing is traceable to basic writing skills garnered in grade school and that "many of us have forgotten the lessons that we learned from English 101" (Author 32). That is, one can be a great writer by using and applying learned, static rules where writing is not subject to a particular discourse community but sustains exterior rules as its own separable skill: "the last thing that I will say is that…the best writers read books on writing…They get grammar books…they read books on writing" (Author 29). This is reminiscent of the windowpane view of technical writing. In Miller's (1979) windowpane theory, where technical writing has one clear purpose to objectively demonstrate the scientific point and get out of the way of scientific methodology and conclusions. The notion that one type of writing exists is underpinned by a "positivistic view of science" (Miller, 1979, p. 612) writing, which consists of a pure, denotative observational language. In this view of writing, language can only work to the detriment of the science and writing is most effective when "the writing doesn't get in the way of the point" (Author 18). Additionally, good writing is bifurcated between scientific observational language and language that is a "writing trick," (Author 3) or rhetoric.

Although this technical view of social science writing was well-represented in the sample, this notion of a singular language was complicated by other authors and conversations where scholars saw differences in the way disciplines write their literature. Beyond the basics, scholars noted that it is important to follow conventional rules in writing practice: "I have written for other journals and so forth—so I've had to adapt and learn that if I'm going to do this that I've got to write to their style to the way these journals want things…so that is a challenge when you grow and learned to do things one

way, that one way, you know you could publish it one way and someone from another field is saying that it isn't good, it isn't written proper" (Author 13). In this view of writing, scientific disciplines are replete with characteristic writing rules which range from rigid to tacit and involve guidelines on structuring, format, citations, and other styling choices:

> I think you have to really be able to follow the convention. I think most Criminology writers that are very good if you want to get published, you have to follow the rules. I publish mostly in non-Criminology journals…and they have different rules. In Public Health, for example, no theory please just facts. Very different of course in Criminology in which you know if you don't have theory it's not interesting. So I think following the rules for successful writing, not good writing (Author 22).

The previous except demonstrates that different fields have conventions that promote successful writing procedures including what information is valuable, definitions of what constitutes a fact, and whether successful and good writing are distinct concepts. Perhaps, more than anything, following the rules indicate a respect for the science and the field because it indicates thoughtful procedures and care of the research design: "It [good grammar] indicates the care with which the authors have put together the manuscript…it's tedious to proofread carefully but if you're a fastidious scholar you do that" (Author 17). Authors elicited the need to follow writing conventions and practices that are specific to the discipline and that following the specific rules of the field demonstrate appreciation for the field and respect for high-quality work.

However, to complicate scientific writing further—as writing studies have demonstrated through research—different levels of rules exist within even one discourse community (e.g. disciplinary, sub-disciplinary, scientific values and the individual text

choices) and often can contradict, overturn or conflict with one another in writing practices (Fairclough, 1992; Sword, 2012). In practice, the notion that different sub-disciplines entertain distinct writing values may be seen across sub-disciplines in criminology—such as the difference between mainstream and critical criminology schools. Or as shown earlier in this dissertation, writing values can alter across different methodological orientations. Thus, although scholars recognized that conventions must be followed, they often were unsure of where those rules come from: "I have no idea that's a good question…So I have no idea. In Economics an empirical article should start with actually a two-page plain language description. You know the problem and what the article accomplishes and you never see that in Criminology. Economics hasn't always been that way but I have no idea how it evolved" (Author 22). As teased out in the earlier chapters of this dissertation, it is likely that this confusion of where the writing rules come from sprouts from the way different levels of rules contradict one another (e.g. basic grammar rules and field conventions) and the multiple sources that come together in the production of style for particular outlets (e.g. positivism, sociology, APA, basic English grammar rules, etc.). At the base of understanding writing in criminology, scholar beliefs about writing seemed to speak to the tension of having multiple levels of conflicting rules in discourse communities.

Throughout the course of interviews, scholars were asked about their beliefs considering the most important characteristics for good writing in criminology. In addition, scholars were asked to describe who they believed to be the best writers, specifically drawing out the characteristics of writing that makes that person a great writer. The following represents the most common themes discussed during the course of

interviews with the sample of the most influential scholars in the field. The characteristics that will be discussed include: 1) *Questions with Purpose*; 2) *Structure and Organization*; 3) *Redundancy and Length*; 4) *Clear and Complex*; 5) *Engaging and Compelling*, and 6) *Storytelling*.

Questions with Purpose

The most influential scholars felt a primary characteristic of good writing evolved through the purpose and intent of the study. On the surface, providing a clear description of the question underlying the research was a significant step in writing the manuscript. The question was described as a mechanism to reveal the underlying purpose and intent of the research, and is the first step in becoming qualified to speak to the criminological audience. As Leitch (1983, p. 145) notes, "a speaker must be 'qualified' to talk…who may speak, what may be spoken, and how it is to be said; in addition [rules] prescribe what is true and false, what is reasonable and what is foolish, and what is meant and what not." The first step in accomplishing this process of discourse community initiation is by talking about something that is acceptable to the community by asking an important question: "sometimes people call it the big fucking deal question—like who gives a shit—and when you step back and ask does anybody care other than me" (Author 3)? Thus, discourse community members must speak to one another through the text and inform others where their information fits into the larger picture. Speaking to the community and being heard involves saying something purposeful and pertinent to the community. As described by scholars, saying something with purpose involves engaging the literature and identifying important topics and gaps in the research that the researcher

may fill. First and foremost, to speak to the community with purpose is to ask a question that they value.

An effectively honed question with an important underlying purpose is not only about content, but also about communication. That is, scholars identified that an acute research question provides the reader a particular level of clarity: "I think that it is really important to let the reader know why and what you are writing right at the front…Making it clear what you are trying to say and why you are saying each thing, so it all makes sense. Those are the technical things of setting out why the research is important" (Author 30). As the previous author notes, the production of a clear and straightforward question is important to speaking in a technical and specialized manner. In turn, a keen question with a clear purpose exceeds qualifying the speaker, and acts as a communication mechanism for the vernacular in the manuscript: "I think you have to be pretty clear in your intentions about what you product [is]—what are the research questions or the goal that your project is trying to achieve" (Author 5).

The construction of a good question is not only useful in demonstrating how one contributes to an area of knowledge but offers the reader a conceptual outlining of what the paper is going to accomplish. Thus, a question of purpose should both engage the reader and provide information into the following knowledge retained in the document:

> Well, I pretty much always start with what I call the first page and a half where I kind of draw the reader in doing the hook, then I start up front with the purpose of the study of the manuscript…I think that is very important when I do peer reviews one of my common comments to authors is that I like to see the purpose up front…I think that gives a roadmap for the reader. And when you put the purpose there everything else that I read from the point on in the literature review makes a lot more sense and to me is more organized and coherent, then if I put the purpose about 5 or

> 6 pages in right before the present study or right before the message or whatever it is. Where I see sometimes people do that, it might be my own preference, but I do think that it makes a better read for the audience (Author 28).

Beyond the production of knowledge, the question is seen as beneficial for the reader in order to transmit or disseminate the knowledge effectively to the intended audiences. It is not simply that the question must fit into the surrounding research, but that it must be the initial step of being communicable to those audiences.

Finally, beyond knowledge construction and the readability of the text, the production of a good question has writing implications for the author. Since publication is the end goal of writing manuscripts, questions were often seen to be important to the writer in developing the manuscript. The question (or purpose) is seen as having a direct connection with the idea and conceptualization behind the article. Questions need to be developed in order to ensure that something is publishable: "Sometimes I'll talk to younger scholars and they will throw out these ideas and they are just too small. Sure you could publish it or is it worth the effort to publish that or is it worth it to go a little bit bigger, going slower and getting a more interesting story" (Author 3). This excerpt demonstrates that questions of upcoming scholars are often too small (or too big as mentioned by other scholars) and this indicates that the theme of the document is often not honed enough to be considered publishable-level material. The question should be obvious throughout and originate from the original purpose of the article.

The question is supposed to indicate the primary purpose of the research to audiences and be presented as early as possible. The following author identifies that title as a mechanism that captures the central theme or underlying question of the article: "...but the point is that this article, after I [changed the title]; it changed the whole tenor

of the article because it tied at the end to an existing critique of criminological theories…so, now, that understanding of framing the article along that theme, it changed the whole introduction of the article, it changed the whole value of the article" (Author 29). Using the title as a means to understand and relay the purpose of the article provides two important points in technical writing in criminology. First, the title represents the earliest potential point for the underlying purpose of the article to be relayed to the audience. The title can contain the question of the research and thus represent the purpose of the research to the reader at the earliest possible point. Second, the title can embody the theme of the article allowing authors to more effectively structure their article, giving the article an identity, and allowing the author to whittle down the manuscript to a core theme.

Overall, scholars suggested that providing a question with underlying value and purpose is an important characteristic of producing good writing in criminology. A question alone seemed to be insufficient but it should additionally engage the literature, mimic the technical language, provide information to the reader about what is accomplished in the paper and, above all, is indicative of the underlying value of the paper. A manuscript without a question of this nature is lacking an important criminological writing value.

Structure and Organization

The most influential scholars also noted how the structuring of a particular paper was endemic to good writing. The structure of a paper typically follows a conventional format in the social sciences known as IMRAD. In this typical paper structure, the paper utilizes an introduction section (that often reveals a purpose statement), a methodology

section (that reveals replicable steps and procedures), a results section (that demonstrates data analysis), and a discussion or conclusion section. This style of structuring documents is indicative of hypothetic-deductive approaches to social science and "is favored in the sciences and in quantitative research in the social sciences, where there is a sense of the gradual, incremental, and collaborative accumulation of knowledge toward shared agreement about some phenomenon or another" (Pare, 2011, p. 68). In a hypothetic-deductive approach to social science, research is based upon experimental hypothesis testing where the goal is to draw out universal laws for human behavior (Brent & Kraska, 2010). Although interpretive and critical sciences come from a different paradigm, these other types of research are often fitted with the classic hypothetic-deductive writing structure in order for a researcher to qualify to speak within the discourse community (Sollaci & Pereira, 2004).

The classic structure is seen as providing an element of logic, clarity and a formula for displaying an argument to the academic community. A predetermined structure combats the randomness and the chaos that often come of artistic creativity in writing and provides a common frequency for academics to communicate:

> I want to get the idea across – most people don't write like that they have too many things going on in their head – they try to skip points – they leave ideas dangling or unclear, right? A lot of things go on inside a writer's head that don't appear in the paper. Right so my writing always is – it is it is very structured and one idea leads to the next and I am able to take things and explain them in a way that just about everyone can understand them (Author 29).

At its core, using the classic structure of writing articles allows communication between author and reader by having presupposed expectations for what should be within the pages of the document: "I'd say the first thing [for good writing] is that everything has to

have a logical setup—you have to very clearly lay out your rationale for stuff… I think that [the IMRAD structure] contributes to it. It helps people organize and set up the expectation, the organizational scheme that they should use" (Author 7). The presupposed knowledge of what is coming allows members of a discourse community to navigate the manuscript and manipulate it to their need. They are able to jump from one place to another, to consume only the pieces of the article they need or simply understand the article more clearly in the first read through:

> But I think overall having the common structure is pretty good because then most readers come to expect what will happen and what they expect to see in an article. And so that doesn't mean they can anticipate the actual content, but it's that they know the structure, they know what is coming. And then it also helps you too if you need to jump to certain pieces of the paper, of an article, without having read the earlier parts you know where to look if you are looking for certain types of information (Author 1).

Thus, the IMRAD structure is seen as important because it provides logic to the document that both author and reader can interpret and use to their advantage during the construction or consumption of information.

Additionally, the structure can demonstrate how a paper should connect findings with larger implications and contributions. As authors explained, the underlying purpose of the IMRAD structure is the ability to construct the manuscript in a particular shape in order to make an argument that is rife with implications larger than the piece itself. The IMRAD structure accomplishes this by using an hourglass shape of writing:

> I think of an hourglass where you want to be able to set up the problem in a way to emphasize the brick of the general issues under investigation and then you have to kind of go down into the nuts and bolts of the specific aspect of that more general issues that I'm going to be addressing in this research…then at the end, you've got to go back and relate

> it to the more general world to tease out the larger implications and contributions of the piece. So you know, kind of broad, narrow and broad in a very general sort of way… (Author 18).

The Uneven U is represented as an hourglass in the previous excerpt. The logic of the hourglass metaphor for structure and organization allows the author to zoom in and out of micro and macro levels of knowledge. In other words, in the hourglass metaphor, an author provides a foundation of the broader literature, sweeps into the individual level of the study and is able to zoom back out and contextualize the findings by demonstrating how results fit into the research and implication literature.

However, the effective structure is not only contained in whole sections but can manifest in individual paragraphs. Effective structure is found in two ways: good fit between paragraphs and concepts, and logical, short distance between points. That is, each paragraph should contain one concept and no more or less:

> Sometimes the most challenging part for me is the introduction; what is the best way to set it up, to clearly set it up. And sometimes what I will do when I am writing is map out what this paragraph, what the best point is going to be when I am setting up these paragraphs. Let's say I have a concept, there are ten paragraphs in the point I am trying to make—what is the concept for paragraph one, paragraph two and so on. And once I have that structure it helps me write that paragraph. Oftentimes, and I am guilty of this early in my career, is that you try to say too much and when you try to say too much or express too much with large words it will make things more clustered than necessary (Author 8).

This sentiment that one is trying to say too much or offer too many unnecessary words, is indicative of the word-content ratio of windowpane theory (Miller, 1979), where paragraphs, sentences, and words represent a container that holds a single concept snugly, by using no more words than necessary. In this vein, authors insisted that paragraphs

should be limited to one concept at a time. Like a sentence that discusses only one thing at a time, a paragraph should not indulge multiple concepts simultaneously. Put differently, a paragraph should use just enough language so that the concepts "fit," or are appropriately explained.

In addition to the good fit of each paragraph, each paragraph should connect in a linear and logical fashion. Paragraphs should be directly connected to one another:

> Another thing that I look for in writing is organization. You know when we write for professional journals, when we're writing our theoretical papers it should be coherent and I like to think of it as linear, where one thing leads to another that leads to the next thing. There's a logical sequencing of the writing. The structure is very logical and linear, "A" goes to "B," goes to "C," goes to "D." I find for myself outlines are very important. Not only before I write, but after I have a written draft I go back and see if all of the paragraphs hang together the way they should—you know, that this one follows from that or if this is subsumed under a general topic and sometimes I discover no, it's not as well organized as it should be (Author 17).

An effective structure is one in which each paragraph has one concept and these concepts are linked together in a logical manner. In addition, paragraphs should also link back to the primary theme—or the purpose and question of the research. Thus, scholars indicate a delicate balance in which paragraphs must deliver single concepts that also connect back to the underlying purpose of the paper. For instance, Author 4 describes a colleague that has an effective technique of structuring articles:

> …he always has his list of 3, and so, when you read his writing he will often say that there are three important points. And he will actually say that this is the first, the second is this, this is the third. Not always, but when he is telling a story in his writing, he guides you, and leads you on that story in a very obvious way to where you are never wondering what is the next point again? Because he will tell you….they guide you, and again it is not simple. It

> sounds simple, but to me at least, there are almost guideposts in his writing that allow you to know where he is going…..Yeah, I think that organization is the key… I think before you even begin writing you think about, 'okay, what is my story' and then outline that story. And in doing so, you are leaving clues along the way like here is where I am going to go next. It is just a really easy way to get your point across… (Author 4).

As the previous author illuminates, the structure and organization of the article promote clarity by making logical connections for the reader. The reader is able to easily follow from one logical point to the next and follow along through a technique of three points.

Like a house of cards, effective structure is about having only pieces that maintain utility; that is, each paragraph and sentence should be important to the integrity of the text: "A great writer knows how to communicate. And one way to really know [if someone is a great writer] is to pull out a sentence of somebody's paper or pull out a paragraph. If you can pull out a sentence and the whole paragraph falls apart that is a pretty good indicator" (Author 31). Thus, good structure is not a simple concept that is located only in the overall organization (or IMRAD) of the document, but rather one that evaluates the placement of each section, paragraph, and sentence throughout the piece:

> Well, it is sort of a scale issues because the purpose of our articles and chapters and books and so forth is to convey ideas—that are often nuanced and complex…so it goes down to the level of the sentence—is that sentence necessary? Is this sentence clear, does this sentence add something, and then it goes to the paragraph? Every paragraph should essentially have one idea. When you move beyond that thing get less clear and more difficult for readers to follow (Author 15).

At the bottom of structure and organization, it seems that each level of the document (e.g. section, paragraph, sentence, and word) should have a proper fit of content and a logical flow of points. That is to say, a section should accomplish one function (relative to the

Uneven U), each paragraph should entertain one concept, and each sentence one fundamental point that forms the integral building blocks of the piece.

Redundancy and Length

While structure in criminology is about making sure sections, paragraphs and sentences have one primary point and about connecting the pieces in a logical fashion, another primary characteristic of good writing is found in the ability to remove redundancy. Problematically, redundancy was seen as adding unnecessary length, adding confusion and ambiguity to the writing and diminishing any engaging characteristic possible in technical writing. Redundancy is seen as an unfortunate byproduct of writing and good writers have the ability to recognize repetitiveness and reduce it. Primarily redundancy was seen as manifesting in two forms, language, and length.

Scholars noted that the removal of redundant language played a primary role in the production of good writing:

> Brevity is another one; I find that language is very redundant. People say the same things over again. Going back and editing carefully and getting rid of redundancy and excess language and stuff that isn't necessary, is really important. Whatever the core message is becomes highlighted and becomes clearer. So I think that also is important. Trying to stay away from jargon that's not necessary is important. If you are presenting statistical results there are some technical terms that have to be used. In the general writing we do in criminology, I think that a lot of times, using straightforward common language is more important than fancy [language that] obscures what you are trying to get at (Author 36).

While the removal of redundancy is an important aspect of technical writing, the previous author notes that it is not something that happens in first drafts but rather comes through the editing process. Oftentimes, following drafts allow the author the ability to remove

language that repeats points. The author goes on to indicate that redundancy is often useful in the early stages of writing, but is ineffective in communicating a point in research to an audience:

> I agree that redundancy has value, it's often helpful. At the same time, it's unfettered like a curve in a relationship. Up to a certain point is valuable to present whatever the ideas are. There are a couple different ways to get the core idea across. But then having done that, if that continues it will make the story unattractive and boring then it detracts from the quality of the writing. I think that one of the things that we have to learn as we write more is where the inflection point is, that tipping point. For a while, we present the same idea but somewhat differently [it] has value and after a while, it doesn't, it's detracting. Learn where that is in the editing process and begin to get rid of the second part that is less helpful (Author 36).

Interestingly, the author notes that redundancy is an organic feature of writing: "Language is almost by definition redundant. The exposition of language is redundant. To a certain point, that's good because you can make the same point a couple different ways" (Author 36). It is typical for an author to make a point repeatedly in the process of writing a document. However, good writing involves noticing the existence of redundancy and eliminating it from final versions in future revisions.

Although redundancy is often constituted (and eliminated) at the level of the sentence, the negative characteristic of redundancy emerges in the production of article length. Among criminological scholars, article length is seen as often failing to ascertain the shortest distance between one's points and to be unnecessarily wordy, eliciting confusion and ambiguity: "Writing a social science paper is an arduous task. They are typically very lengthy, there is a lot of prose and verbal prose if you will--there is a lot of elements to a social science paper that can be reduced without necessarily losing any of

the science...And especially you know, the front end or the back end, where the authors are often times filling space... (Author 15). Across the board, scholars felt as though the length of criminology articles were often excessive and unnecessary. Harkening back to *Questions with Purpose*, excessive paper length is situated as a failure to uncover the underlying question in one's paper and results in the author writing on too many themes at once:

> In general, shorter manuscripts are better than longer manuscripts, and of course, a lot of that is dictated by the journals. They don't usually take manuscripts that are of excessive length. So it's just staying on topic; it is something that everyone struggles with when they are starting out. What a lot of people struggle with is getting off course. If you are writing about a specific program, for example, you are writing that evaluation. It's very easy to talk about something broader than what this evaluation is actually of and the next thing you know you have 2 or 3 topics—and it isn't really good. It tends to bog down reviewers and cause a little bit of confusion…I think that reviewers get tired and I think they [journal outlets] want to publish more manuscripts. When you have a goal of 20-25 page manuscript that can force you to be more focused and I think that that is good (Author 13).

As a shared rule, while scholars identified there were times for lengthy manuscripts, they suggested that papers in criminology are too long and suffer from length-based redundancy. In this, scholars suggested that redundancy could be found within repeated words and sentences, but a question that not effectively honed could lead to writing on too many themes.

Commonly, literature reviews were seen a central site of redundancy and excessive length. Scholars often suggested that criminological literature reviews are guilty of being excessive and repetitive across topics. For instance, the following excerpt

illuminates an interesting contrast with the use of IMRAD structuring of scientific articles:

> I would rather publish 10 articles that are all 20 pages long that are all contributions to the field as opposed to 5 that are all 40 pages long that are contributions to the field...I don't know what I would get but I would conservatively say 10 to 15 of page space in the sense that it is not being needed—if you have three articles in one issue all on self-control theory do you really need three 10-page literature reviews on self-control theory (Author 26).

A common point made by scholars was that literature reviews were often excessive and overly redundant across the board. Scholars questioned where the baseline of knowledge should be drawn when writing an article for academic journals. Thus, when it came to length, redundancy was described as defining a baseline of knowledge that readers should already know. The majority of scholars indicated that literature reviews should be shorter in general and refrain from repeating basic components of theories. Thus, the previous scholar contrasted the classic IMRAD structure in which researchers are implored to contextualize research questions through explanatory literature reviews. Although the literature review may implore authors to set the stage for communication purposes, influential scholars suggested that this mindset catalyzes repetitiveness in writing:

> I don't know how it [lengthy literature reviews] ended up this way, I think it's just tradition and reviewers will ask for it which seems very strange to me. But if I have to read another article that explains to me that routine activities theory requires a motivated offender, a...do you know what I mean? Really, you can't assume that we know that already? It's a fairly established theory (Author 33).

This illuminates an intriguing debate of what information authors can assume is common knowledge and how assuming knowledge can conflict with efforts of clarity and communication. Presumably, the core components of theories are included to increase

accessibility and clarity of the science to practitioners, those outside the field, or even scholars in the field unfamiliar with the theoretical orientation. A new reader may pick up a scientific article and follow along by learning the basics. Ironically, an effort to reduce the length by shortening repetitive descriptive information in literature reviews could be seen as undermining communicative power to outside audiences.

In contrast, however, students are trained to write in a comprehensive manner. The conversion from writing term papers, theses and dissertations to scientific articles is a considerable gap. Legitimacy of term papers is often determined by breadth and comprehensiveness, whereas scientific manuscripts by brevity and a removal of redundancy. Training often relies on comprehensive papers that task students with demonstrating an extensive field of knowledge, whereas articles involve investigating individual phenomenon often under a microscopic gaze:

> I think it has to do with the ways we have been trained, the way we teach our students; all the way from the time they were undergrad to the present. And in the psychological disciplines they are writing empirical articles from the time, or the style of empirical articles with statistics, all the way from the time they are sophomores to the time they get their Ph.D. But when it comes to the Criminological fields we take more of a sociological view, which is a huge piece of criminology and criminal justice; is that we don't really start writing the empirical stuff until master's degree on…And by that time we are so ingrained that it has to be 25, 30, 40, 50 pages it is so thick that things can get lost (Author 20).

From this view, upcoming scholars can internalize the notion that paper validity and knowledge legitimacy are based upon comprehensive length. Thus, a core tension of establishing writing legitimacy is complicated by not simply having something to say, but by having *enough* to say to be considered intelligent, as being well researched and as

being a legitimate speaker in the community. In contrast, and ironically, the most influential scholars opposed this intrinsic core principle of writing, where the *shorter the better* was a primary principle and excessive length was indicative not of scientific legitimacy but of ineffective conceptualizing and a failure to sharpen the primary theme of the paper.

The problem of redundancy for new scholars insists that writing should not concentrate on having enough to say, but rather saying a lot with the fewest words. Put another way, writing acumen involves taking a lengthy or wordy description of a phenomenon and converting it into a direct and brief exposition without losing content. Or, as author 17 exemplifies: "I don't even know if you would be familiar with it, C Wright Mills [The Sociological Imagination], where he takes Parsons in like three pages and in one paragraph communicates more effectively what Parsons had [said] in those three pages." This type of technique, where longer exposition is reduced to fewer words without removing content, exemplified the role that redundancy played in beliefs about writing and establishing author legitimacy.

The Clear and Complex Balance

The characteristics of redundancy existed directly adjacent to a clear and complex balance that scholars indicated was an important characteristic of good writing. Although limiting redundancy was an ability to reduce repetitive language and length, great writers were seen as having an ability to creatively say a lot in a few words. That is to say, the best writers were drawn as having an ability to speak to audiences through a delicate balance between clear writing and having an ability to say complex things about the

world. In other words, the clear-complex balance involves an author's ability to relay complex or abstract concepts in simple and straightforward words:

> And I think that the way I look at the great writers, the people I consider to be great writers, one thing they all have is that they can describe incredibly complex ideas in very simple terms. That is something they all have and when you read it, it reads effortlessly but you it's one thing to see this and understand it. But when you read it, it's just like, "gosh that is the clearest explanation that there is on whatever." It could be some concept, it could be some fancy statistical thing, but you know it's just incredibly clear (Author 10).

Clarity manifests through an ability to translate criminological issues in ways that are simple to glean but that also involves a considerable depth of content. Scholars contend that a foundational mechanism of clarity is the ability to convey subject matter using the least number of words possible: "They articulate complex ideas sometimes that I have seen without using too many words…" (Author 8).

At the heart of finding the correct balance on the clear-complex balance is a process of finding the correct language. Finding the appropriate language for a paper is a difficult exercise that not everyone effectively engages in and requires experience. The following scholar describes a colleague they believe is particularly strong at finding the appropriate words for the topic at hand:

> I have collaborated with a lot of people and he is just above people, the way he writes …So it was his ability to phrase it in a certain way that made it a better paper and I think he touched on some of the writing, I mean…he just has a way of finding that right word for a certain [topic]. It is something I am just not good at doing—depending on topic I can find the word, but he has much more experience finding the right word or phrase to just make it say it I guess (Author 6).

Interestingly, in finding the balance between clarity and complexity, an author is celebrated for not simply removing words to make the concept fit snugly, but for the creative choice of word usage in the description. Surprisingly then, clarity can often be seen sprouting from engaging, artful and creative writing. Put differently, there is something creatively unique about the way the individual molds descriptive language:

> …but I think what really sets them apart is that they are just classy people I guess; with the language they are very artful about using language in different ways…and he will take a sentence, an important sentence, that I have written that I think is very clear and he rewrites it in a way that is kind of artfulness; it is about his use of language (Author 27).

Somewhat in contrast to redundancy, which considers the quantity of words used to describe something, the clear-complex balance involves the extent in which a talented author could distill complicated phenomena, of which most people struggled to articulate, into plain wording. This represents a distinction from the previous characteristics in which good criminological writing was often structural (in the organization), about overarching themes (*Questions with Purpose*) or improving communication through reduction (*Redundancy and Length*). Where the previous sections were about setting rigid structure throughout the composition process of criminological articles, the clear-complex balance is about creativity; about saying things in a way others would rarely consider. Put differently, where other sections involved conformity, such as similar structuring patterns, the clear-complex balance lauded creative differences and individualization: "Temptation sometimes to use flowery language is unnecessary. Now you know elegant is better than pedestrian if it's not at the expense of clarity and sometimes people get carried away with themselves and I've done this myself and been called on it. But good writing is clear, to the point and crisp" (Author 17). Although the

clear-complex balance introduces creativity to the equation, it is still tempered by the need to be communicable. The previous quote effectively demonstrates the balance element of being clear and complex; that is, good writing is a combination of the two in which they complement one another.

The previous characteristics all come outside of or prior to the act of exposition. That is, they involve setting up what will be said in the document or what the document eventually will become. For example, the question suggests the underlying value of the paper, the organization involves constructing an outlined map of where paragraphs and sentences will be situated, and redundancy involves reforming manuscripts by eliminating length after the words are on the page. These are all important literary practices that surround, but culminate in, the process of writing itself. However, the excerpts from scholars in this section indicate the complicated process of transforming those outside literary processes into words on paper. The actual process of putting words on paper is a tense intellectual exercise where surrounding practices and creative talent collide at the same site. Authors are constantly working to strike a balance, where there is a tipping point in which artfulness can exceed its utility.

Engaging and Compelling

In addition to finding this balance, authors across the board noted the importance of writing to be engaging and compelling to the reader: "I appreciate a little bit of humor in the writing and a little irreverence isn't a bad thing either. But they back it up by being very smart" (Author 33). Although an engaging characteristic was noted as an important feature of good writing, scholars lamented the lack of engaging work and the dry technical writing that tends to flourish in Criminology:

> I think that it [engaging] is important in any kind of writing. I think that we only have so much time in our lives and brain capacity to be reading things and there is kind of nothing worse than giving an afternoon to a paper and then realizing there wasn't anything of interest in there. You just spent an afternoon reading something that someone was forced to get a publication out, they need this for tenure, they needed this for promotion but they really didn't have anything to say. I mean I am as guilty as anybody, I have produced dozens of those kinds of pieces and it is a real shame, you know, our publishing world has gone crazy… (Author 32).

In the above passage, the author notes that a lack of passion in work is facilitated by a promotion and tenure system that strong-arms young scholars to produce a particular number of published works in a brief amount of time. Similarly to the clear-complex balance, the lack of engaging writing was often related to the relationship between disciplinary writing conventions that are enforced by journal outlets and individual creativity in word choices and phrasing. Notice how the following author discusses the interaction between being creative and writing like a criminologist early in their career:

> Where someone else who might be writing the exact same paper might be able to take all of those articles and write in a much more engaging way. I always had a difficult time when I started writing. Let's say I was looking at this topic, I was looking at the difference between X and Y, and there were only five studies that were done on X and Y. Well, I would write it like a term paper. Like, "okay, there have been five studies that have been done on this; study 1 did this." And it would be like a detailed overview, it would almost be an annotated bibliography for each of those. It was not wrong, but I was even bored reading it, I was bored writing it. And I think what scholars learn to do is not to write it in such a monotone sort of way that is repetitive...there is a rigid way of doing things and it is very structured. You have the introduction, you have got the methods, you have got the results, but within that, there is a lot of variability...If everything was the same—if it was sort of an assembly line—it wouldn't matter who wrote it. It would turn out the same (Author 2).

Thus, writing in a compelling and engaging manner is a complicated task of navigating the space between the structured processes of the discourse community and the individual choices of the author. To write an engaging piece was to not be completely limited by outlet style conventions and rules. Rather, producing engaging text meant making the piece different than another author would have done with the same data and results.

This complicates typical philosophies of technical writing, where writing is supposed to be impartial and objective because producing engaging work is often subjective in the writing and words themselves: “It has that combination of science writing and literary engagement, if you know what I mean. It is just highly readable, well written while maintaining the science part…I think it [literary] adds a bit of engagement to the reader. It sort of runs along the line of science and journalism writing” (Author 14). It may seem that this engaging theme contradicts previous characteristics identifying clarity, and often, conformity. Yet, this finding, of the importance engaging writing, is not necessarily in conflict. For instance, engaging writing can co-exist with the common paper structure used in the social sciences (e.g. IMRAD), by benefitting from the best qualities of both: "that kind of structure could be restrictive for you or problematic for you in some ways. But I find that it is liberating in the sense that if I had just, you know, a blank canvas and somebody said ‘make an article out of this.’ I would find that too daunting of a challenge. So to have that kind of expectation of the traditional format, I find it okay, much more easy for me" (Author 32). As the passage notes, the structure of technical social science writing can have its benefits. Further, what these quotes illuminate is that the creative element in writing, that makes text engaging or compelling to read, must strike a balance with the communicability—or structural similarities—of

the text. While interesting word choices and phrases can make a text enjoyable to read, there is a balance authors often attempt to strike between creativity and convention, between writing structure and agency.

Overall, compelling and engaging work was perceived to have a larger utility than simply for a scholar's own enjoyment. Rather, at times, engaging writing was seen as providing increased clarity in writing. Like previous authors, the following author notes that writing in an engaging form is important to draw people to the idea, but also notes that engaging writing is tempered by the disciplinary limitations of the field:

> Being boring is never a good thing because that could take a very important finding and if you are not a good writer it can never clearly be stated—so it will lack power. And if it is stated in very boring ways then you're going to fail to get other people excited about it…We are restricted, we have to use certain terminology and conventions so that our readers understand it... (Author 5).

Interestingly, the author links the ability to communicate with the notion of "writing power." In this sense, the power of a text is located in the ability to attract and engage an audience. The notion that engaging and creative work can actually give a text more clarity is a counter-position to the conventional notion that artfulness and clarity are hermetic opposites. Whereas clarity suggests impartiality, objectivity, and denotative language, creativity suggests that writing is based on artistic choice and has an element of subjectivity that is seen as improving the writing.

In addition, producing engaging work falls in line with the ability to communicate science to communities outside of criminology: "For science writing, I am going to go out on a limb and say yes it is important to be enjoyable. People will slog through. I have a dear colleague who shall remain nameless. Who is very famous and people really

respect his ideas and the work he does. But to a person, they will talk about how difficult it is to get through his writing because it is so dense and complex. It is important, but it is more important when you are trying to reach a more general audience than academics" (Author 30). Of course, a reader can still trudge through dense writing, but, general audiences are seen as benefitting most when they are engaged. Engaging and compelling work is seen as having function, beyond its personal aesthetic appeal, in its ability to draw readers in from general audiences, involving public, practitioners and other disciplines unfamiliar with the criminological terminology. In contrast, "dense and complex" writing fails to capture the interests of scholars and public individuals unfamiliar with the terminology. Thus, the more engaging the work, the stronger potential it has to speak to audiences outside of the criminological spectrum.

In addition, engaging work is perceived to be important in the review process. It is perceived that reviewers are less likely to consider a manuscript for publication that is dense, less compelling and that has a lower chance to engage or attract in a wide range of readers: "Reviewers are reading something that is just poorly written and boring, not well-organized; doesn't bode well for the outcome in the review process. If it does get published, the papers are less likely to get picked up, less likely to be assigned in class, less likely to be cited because they don't present the idea in a clear, precise manner" (Author 36). Thus, engaging work lends itself to improving an author's clarity, because readers are more likely to invest, to read multiple times, and to follow along with the particular piece. Producing compelling writing influences the importance of a piece beyond the review process. As the previous scholar notes, the compelling nature of the writing influences whether a particular idea gains traction in the community.

Engaging writing also serves an individual purpose for the scholar. Engaging text serves as a process of transmitting one's passion for the work to their reader. Dry, technical writing was seen as lacking passion, whereas engaging and compelling work was perceived as an indication that the author enjoys their work. Thus, passion for one's work was seen to be the central crux of whether the piece was perceived as enjoyable for the reader. Passion was seen as being felt through words, the question, the structuring of argument and helped to capture the readers' interest:

> Now again, not every article I write is compelling, not every article I write has a great theme but that is what I am striving for. I am striving to make something seem important to the reader and once they do they are likely to want to read the article…And I love finding out things, I like exploring things, I really like working with people. I like working with my graduate students, working with my friends. To me it is a social enterprise, it is fun working together, it is fun exploring things, it is fun talking on the phone about articles. So a lot of what sustains me in publishing is because it is enjoyable (Author 29).

The previous author links writing engaging articles and research projects (question, etc.) with the intrinsic passion they have for exploring, discussing and exacting research. In this, the scholar links their own passion to providing an engaging and attractive paper for their audience to read. In this way, the author transmits their own passion for the research process and discovery, which can be felt within the writing of the article for an interested reader.

The ability to transmit one's passion and make a text engaging is often described as the way an individual turns a phrase or the word choices an individual makes. For instance, Author 1 notes that a simple turn of phrase can invite an individual to engage in the material: "…or that we no longer consider that theory to be a leading theory—that

could be a very academic way of saying it—but [Scholar] would say that we have moved that theory to the criminological waste-bin and it gives the same point across. It is very direct and everyone knows what he means. But it is a fun way of saying it, it is a more engaging way of saying it" (Author 1). As good writers are able to transmute jargon and heavy technical phrasing into words that are more consumable, the reader begins to feel passion travel through the piece:

> ...but when I think of the people who are good authors I think of people who really guidepost. I guess one person that brings to mind is [scholar]…and I find that, I don't know if it is his phrasing or the very comprehensive understanding of the literature from which he is drawing so that he is able to present his research and frame them in the larger body of work and really articulate what is exciting about what he is finding (Author 5).

As the passage describes, altering technical jargon into more engaging phrases and words can be read as excitement to engage the underlying purpose and findings of the paper.

Although producing engaging work was constructed as having individual benefits, such as creating a smoother peer review process, it was largely about communication with audiences:

> I also try and make writing a little more fun. I think a bit more about someone who is not an academic reading my work. Probably people would see my writing as somewhat on the informal side. I will often have phrases in there that are more popular. To me, it is like a writing style that is little more inviting to everybody rather than speaking to select few (Author 38).

Engaging work was seen as using a turn of phrase where the author transmits passion to the reader and draws in more general audiences unfamiliar with the specialized terminology.

Storytelling

One of the most surprising, and widespread, findings throughout the sample was the use of "storytelling" as an important characteristic and mechanism of writing. Many authors indicated that telling a story was integral to good writing; often in a similar sentiment to the following: "It's got to tell a story from start to finish, has to be compelling from the beginning, and that story has to be focused on some type of empirical result…" (Author 20). Like engaging writing, storytelling is used to draw the reader in and sustain their interest: "You know, it's sort of like without good storytelling the findings lose a lot…in that sense, the findings had a life to them and a reason to want to know about them made that much more something you would want to read and go tell someone else about" (Author 18). In a sense, and perhaps ironically, the creativity evident in these two characteristics (i.e. engaging and storytelling) was drawn as an asset to clarity where a reader is more likely to understand and internalize what they find enjoyable.

Although seemingly similar, storytelling is quite different from engaging writing. Storytelling has little to do with a turn of phrase or a particular hook in the text that draws the reader into the writing:

> I don't think you need a hook or an angle to write a good story by telling a good story. By telling what you did, why you did it, how you did it, and what you found to tell a good story you don't have to have a certain angle on it. Certainly that story being timely and representative of community complaints right now, something like that that someone would say is a hook that is helpful. But I think any question we ask and answer scientifically can tell a story and you can make it interesting. You can make it interesting, but with words and that is our job…that is what

> we do, we tell our science through our writing, through our storytelling (Author 37).

A story exists beyond engaging words and phrases but rests on a more structural or organizational approach to writing in criminology. Storytelling, as told by the scholars, is derived from a couple components. First, a story is constructed as having a primary theme. A primary theme involves the production of a linear storyline or plot. In line with the organization, the storyline should have a linear and logical set of paragraphs. The primary storyline also has a sense of temporality (e.g. beginning, middle and end) but does not wander and discusses only one theme. Second, storytelling involves producing connections within or between discourse communities. That is, a story should demonstrate how a theme connects to the broader literature or to other discourse communities. Whereas engaging writing involves the use of phrases and words to transmit passion within sentences and paragraphs, storytelling is about making connections to the larger discourse community or even interlinking across discourse communities.

In an abstract sense, storytelling is used to describe a linear thematic or conceptual underpinning of the paper. Writing a linear theme is juxtaposed to less effective writing where authors discuss multiple themes or wander from their primary purpose. Often, the linear nature of a storyline comes from the question or underlying purpose of the paper. In other words, storytelling involves how the driving question connects to the larger literature or across different fields. Take for example the following perspective:

> The best articles really do a nice job of setting up "this is what this is about" and making compelling connections by your words and you feel like you're reading a story. You

> know, you're not going to mistake it with good fiction or something, but you're going to feel like there's a coherence to it that really you're doing social science and it's way more engaging than "these are just facts" kind of approach that doesn't feel like it's giving you a strong picture of why somebody would want to do this, how it's done before, and why it's going to be interesting to find out these findings. So in that sense, I think it's really important to have good storytelling sort of within the field (Author 18).

The author does not place storytelling within the content (e.g. fiction versus facts) but instead locates storytelling as "coherence" in the writing. Storytelling exists in the construction of the text and the decision of what and how the author will present information to the reader in the document. The following author agrees that the story of the document is something that coherently produces a linear narrative, something that draws the text to one particular theme:

> All these good articles have a story; they suppose a question of sort. In order to capture the reader's interest, you are telling a story about it. Here is an interesting question and why it is interesting. If we answer it, here is what we are going to learn and here is why it is important. Here is how we go about addressing the methods and results. You're telling the reader a story about this essential question you are posing. Hopefully, by the time you get to the end, you have some answer that brings some closure to it. There is an essential theme that runs through the paper or storyline. Some related things about good writing is that it is rare, to me anyway, that there isn't a central storyline that pulls the whole paper together (Author 36).

Although authors used the disclaimer that they did not actually mean "storytelling" in the conventional literary sense, the recurrent finding was still shocking as it seems so strongly to exist in tension with science. Storytelling is the antithesis of conventional thoughts on fact-based technical science writing; its purpose is to amuse.

Take the following response when I inquired into the definition of the widely used term, storytelling:

> When you are trying to justify the importance of your research, I don't think it is enough to be considered a great writer, enough to get your articles published probably. But to really make a splash with your article I think you really need to be convincing on why it is important and really how it fits into the literature and how this is going to move this field forward and to do that, I think it is in fact, fashioning a story—but in a sense of fiction is not the right word (Author 4).

Like many other authors, Author 4 locates fashioning a good story in the documents "fit" into the discourse community—within sub-disciplinary and disciplinary knowledge in the field.

Thus, in addition to constructing a linear storyline, storytelling seemed to involve constructing a thematic storyline that could then be connected with other discourse communities to demonstrate how the writing fits into the literature, and thus, increases interest from the reader. Often this meant demonstrating how empirical findings fit into the current sub-disciplinary literature, across criminology, with other disciplines or even outside of scientific communities completely:

> So when I think about someone who tells a good story, it's how beautiful he writes that is part of that. He is also an excellent example of someone who sets things up really well. So that is part of selling a really good story, is setting up what it is you are going to talk about. Why is it important? That is all a part of telling a good story rather than saying "I'm going to look at these things," in a technical way, making it complete and bringing it back around (Author 30).

Interestingly, this predilection with being interesting—particularly through storytelling—demonstrates that criminological science heavily depends on the literary ability of the

author to make writing connections (such as "bringing it back around") and bridge intellectual gaps with other discourse communities: "People don't make the story as exciting as it should be. Where you know some people infuse famous quotes from the media, rappers, or people in history and those are interesting because it makes you step back for a moment and contextualize some of the research and realize that it is accessible, and it depends on who you are writing to—for me, research should be accessible to all populations" (Author 26). Science is most profound when it is connected to contemporary events and issues in the public forum. Connecting to popular events and debates provides a way of communicating one's research or tuning to a common frequency across discourse communities by using a literary element that draws in readership to a writing power. Criminological writing becomes more complex than simple technical writing when analyzed inside this lens of storytelling:

> I think it improves—or at least I always thought it did—when I see someone relate structural or an institutionalized entity to a character from a Shakespearean drama. I think it is enriching…because first of all it reminds me on how deficient my knowledge is in Shakespeare but I think that when we can connect things to everyday life or to the human condition—especially if we do that through a connection with the arts, the fine arts—or connecting with other disciplines. I think across the board is a positive (Author 1).

Conclusion

In this chapter, conversations on good writing in criminology through perceptions of the most influential scholars in the field have demonstrated important characteristics they utilize in writing manuscripts. Although the first chapter of the results provided perceptions of commonplace literate practices in criminology, this chapter identified

perceptions of the conceptual qualities of good writing in the field. From a writing studies perspective, investigating perceptions of good writing is important as the terrain of these conventions is socio-culturally situated.

Overall, scholars identified a range of different qualities of good writing. Some of those qualities involved literate work that takes place prior to writing words in the text. For instance, the *So-What Question* and *Structure and Organization* were seen as an important conceptual process of effective writing that often should be considered prior to writing the draft. Additionally, scholars provided text-based qualities, such as *Clear and Complex Balance* and *Engaging* writing, in order to identify a creative element of writing. Last, and most surprisingly, scholars offered a widespread theme of *Storytelling* as a central quality of good writing. Storytelling involved a literary process of connecting one's results to a larger story arch through writing. An author can make connections to broad polemical issues or a broad narrative across literatures in order to make the story consumable by audiences.

CHAPTER 7: THINKING ABOUT WRITING THEORETICALLY

A core aspect of this project is found in bringing writing studies research to the field of criminology. In line with and writing studies—which suggests that practices are negotiated disparately among communities—the previous chapters demonstrated a report of the primary practices and characteristics of good writing as indicated through interviews with scholars. However, this section investigates the underpinning assumptions of these proposed characteristics using a writing studies and literary theoretical framework—which juxtaposes the universal and socio-cultural perspectives—in order to understand how writing works in criminology differs from how we often discuss it. This study argues that we often draw from a universal perspective to discuss writing, despite the fact it is more productive to imagine writing from a socio-cultural perspective. This tension has been demonstrated by analyzing influential scholar quotes within a framework that compares the universal and socio-cultural perspectives.

The universal perspective is pervasive throughout the academia and the public and indicates, as Miller (1979) calls it, a "positivist tradition of writing;" or as Rorty (1978) calls it—"a vertical relationship of representation and what is represented." The universal perspective has a number of philosophical assumptions about writing; for instance, that writing is purely observational, that rhetoric has no place in scientific discourse and that content is entirely separable from the words used to describe it (Miller, 1979). The universal perspective also focuses on another principle of the universal where technical

academic writing is seen as being homogenous and similar across disciplinary boundaries (Lamont, 2009).

In contrast to the universal perspective, socio-cultural perspectives on writing have argued that good writing is negotiated disparately across communities (Lamont, 2009). Although researchers have suggested multiple terms for communities that share practices and values—such as "discourse communities (Bizzell, 1992; Porter, 1986)," "communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 2006), "discursive formations" (Foucault, 2012), "interpretive communities" (Fish, 1980)—they all underpin a socio-cultural constructivist element by which practices, values and thought surrounding writing is negotiated within communities. Early conceptualizations of discourse communities identified that writing is not universal, but differs based on a community of authors (Porter, 1986).

However, contemporary notions of discourse communities have challenged the homogeneity of the discourse community concept itself, identifying that writing is more heterogeneous than a broad discourse community concept can indicate (Prior, 1998). For instance, as Harris (1989) has noted: "...one is always simultaneously a part of several discourses, several communities, is always already committed to a number of conflicting beliefs and practices" (p. 19). Thus, it is the case that an individual scholar's writing style may be a result of the enculturation of their current community (or audience), as well as the discourse communities they have belonged to in the past, forging unique identities and styles. In other words, it is not simply that any author within a discourse community writes similarly but that even smaller sub-sets of discourse communities achieve literate practice and construct values disparately. This chapter demonstrates that a heterogeneous,

socio-cultural perspective most accurately identifies the way writing is seen to work in criminology.

This is accomplished by analyzing the common underlying assumptions of the earlier chapters that investigated literate values of good writing in criminology. The two thematic cruxes of good writing in criminology identify the sections in the chapter, consisting of clarity (i.e. identified in the *So-What Question*, *Structure and Organization*, *Redundancy and Length,* and *The Clear-Complex Balance*) and creativity (i.e. identified by *Engaging* and *Storytelling*).

It is Clarity": Clarity in a Universal versus a Socio-Cultural Lens

The title for this section came from one of the interviews with a prominent scholar in the field. Rhetorically they asked: "But in general what is the purpose of scientific articles?" (Author 29). Answering their own question, they provided an effective summary of early conversations across the board. By and large, the most common explanation in discussions of the most important characteristics of criminological writing was the need for clarity. Criminological scholars largely see the essence of social science writing as a vehicle to transfer and disseminate information to others, such as to the public or practitioners. In part, this characteristic is traceable to origins of the field as a socially applied science (Pratt, 1996; Radzinowicz, 1988), but is complicated by a science with multiple scientific origins (Laub & Sampson, 1991; Garland, 1985, 1997). Largely, the characteristics mentioned by top scholars (e.g. *Question with Purpose*, *Structure,* and *Organization*, *Redundancy and Length*, *Clear and Complex*, *Engaging* writing and *Storytelling*) were underpinned by a desire for clarity. Clarity was a central overarching theme identifying those characteristics as important in criminological

writing. This is obvious in the early characteristics of good writing, but was a surprising finding in the later characteristics—such as storytelling, engaging writing or the clear and complex balance. At times, providing a hook or telling an interesting story was understood as potentially improving clarity for outsider audiences as drawing them to the information.

Regardless of the widespread consensus that "clarity" was the most important aspect of criminological writing, conversations also suggested tensions in defining the term. On one hand, scholars often provided individual definitions of clarity that fell in line with a universal perspective. For instance, many authors suggested on the surface that clarity was something that could be homogenously achieved. This homogenizing clarity concept is often termed "absolute clarity" (Miller, 1979) in writing studies and mimics the universal philosophy of writing, as a singular perspective, in which a purely observational language consisting of standard vernaculars, grammars and syntax can be used to speak to a wide range of audiences unaltered. However, when we take these definitions of clarity from the most productive authors in the field as a whole, we are provided a counter-narrative to these common universal perspectives on writing. When quotes across conversations with forty influential authors are analyzed in tension with one another we see that clarity becomes a heterogeneous and interpretive concept, wherein authors often promoted different definitions of clarity across the board. Thus, the following quotes demonstrate that although technical writing is often thought about from a universal perspective in reality definitions of clarity differ considerably across the group of scholars; and thus, it is more accurate to imagine writing from a socio-cultural perspective.

From the universal perspective, the allure of clarity is that everyone may achieve communication in a field that depends on it. As author 29 noted, "But I do think that it is a skill that can be developed over time. I don't know if someone can be made eloquent but they can be made clear" (Author 29). Clarity is often promoted as something that anyone may achieve if they follow the conventions of the field, involving the literate characteristics revealed in the previous chapter. Yet, as the theoretical framework and the data in this study demonstrates, clarity is a twisted topic that, like the rules of writing, is evaluated with discipline-specific characteristics relative to the discourse community (Lamont, 2009; Sword, 2012). This is not a claim that criminology scholars are wrong about their definitions of clarity, but rather, that it may be helpful to think of the term as dynamic rather than absolute.

Although absolute clarity is discussed from a universal perspective, writing studies has demonstrated from a socio-cultural lens that transmitting messages through language is often more complicated than an observational language would have us initially believe. Philosophical studies, literary theory and writing across discipline research have questioned the potential for messages to be directly transmitted—dominantly explored through the Conduit Metaphor concept—which, identifies from a writing studies perspective the pervasive universal view in academic writing (Abbott & Eubanks, 2005; Eubanks, 2010; Reddy, 1979). The Conduit Metaphor identifies the common universal misconception of absolute clarity, where messages can be directly transmitted from author to reader. As Eubanks (2010) has noted, the Conduit Metaphor is "writing that flows in one direction only, from writer to readership, and is associated predominantly with values such as factual and grammatical correctness, precision,

detachment, and objectivity" (p. 170). In this conception of good writing, language is seen as a container where it "assumes that meaning is put into and taken out of words or texts and that meaning and the language that contains it have an ideal fit" (p. 192). Nonetheless, these elements of the conduit metaphor provide a compelling narrative to draw from when discussing literate practices and as will be shown in the following section authors often do draw from the universal perspective to explain writing processes.

In contrast, this notion of language as purely observational and denotative is challenged by works that demonstrate that discourse communities base specialized and culturally shared languages, and forms of communication, upon metaphors that are negotiated, interpreted, and decoded by members (Lakoff, Espenson & Schwartz, 1991; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Lakoff & Johnson, 2008; Olinger, 2014). In turn, authors can also draw from a socio-cultural perspective to understand the exigencies of literary success in the field. Take for instance the following exchange discussing writing within different fields:

> Author 13: So…then you have to adapt that if you want to do that [write in other fields] and that is a challenge—undoing a lot of learning that has been reinforced over time.
>
> *Interviewer: Do you find yourself having to adapt your language or styles of messaging now that your work is going to other audiences, not just the criminological canon?*
>
> Author 13: Definitely the language. Most criminologists take for granted that you know what that is [the language]. That might not be the case if you're submitting to a Psychology or Law or maybe an administration journal. So yeah, I mean definitely you have to take a step back sometimes and think about things like definitions—like do people [in this field] know what this is?

Thus, authors can draw from the socio-cultural perspective to understand how technical language and metaphors used in the community are negotiated among scholars that have definitions that differ from one community to the next. Of course—from a socio-cultural lens—if terms of technical language and metaphors can alternate depending on the discourse community, then it is plausible that broad universal terms—such as clarity—are not absolute but have definitions that change from one community to the next. Some authors identified that this fluidity of terminologies and language occurs in writing across fields. As author 15 notes, these languages seem distinct to their relative discourse communities:

> It is interesting because when you talk to people in the hard sciences who have read some of the social science stuff, it is almost like we speak different languages; it is almost like we have very different ways of doing things sometimes. And they look at our papers and they say 'you do realize the more you say the more likely you are to be wrong. [*Like talking yourself out of your own points*]. Exactly, and I think it is just the opposite with the social sciences. Social science is a mix of science. It's a mix of philosophy and politics and ideology—I mean all of those things get woven into papers sometimes and that becomes, that makes it very difficult, very tricky (Author 15).

In turn, clarity should entertain different forms particular to the group that is negotiating its definition—in other words, clarity takes on its own style:

> …but I think getting back to the point of a Chemistry abstract or something like that—I agree with you. I have read these things and I have no idea what they are talking about. But it is….for that audience—that gets to my point about audience—it gets to where they are written in a way that there are certain assumptions about what the audience knows and doesn't know, and my guess is that within that world of Chemistry or Physics, or whatever the people, within that field [they] have varying (reputations) about the clarity with which they present their ideas" (Author 27).

From a socio-cultural lens, like specialized terminology, what is considered clear is constantly and dynamically being co-constructed through an interactional process.

The remainder of this chapter demonstrates that although scholars often draw from a universal framework to characterize their own writing when quotes from different scholars are put in scholars about writing in the field author's fall in line with a socio-cultural perspective. Thus, although training in technical criminology writing often demands clarity the authors in this study present a counter-narrative in these terms align more with the socio-cultural perspective and identify a literate heterogeneity between discourse communities. This section has provided an introductive to how narratives of clarity can be drawn from the universal or socio-cultural perspectives. The following section investigates what clarity means to criminology and whether this emanates from a universal or socio-cultural perspective.

Criminological clarity in a writing studies theoretical lens. This section investigates how the most productive authors in criminology draw from a universal perspective to provide definitions of clarity in criminology. Within the criminological discourse community the most influential scholars primarily defined clarity as communication—the ability to speak to others:

> I don't jump around… I don't, and then I think it is, figuring out how do you present an idea in a way that the average reader will understand it. It is not easy and I can't say I do it all the time, but it is what do you say first, what do you say second, what do you say third, what do you say fourth. In other words, if I were telling somebody about something, how would I speak to them, how would I explain it to them" (Author 29)?

Primarily, communication is constructed as transmitting a message to any audience, specialized or general, to exact utility from the research idea and findings. In this sense,

clarity in criminology is defined as "absolute communication" in which writing has the ability to effectively be understood by any community. This focus on clarity as communication across community boundaries aligns with the universal concept of "absolute clarity." As Miller (1979) notes the notion of absolute clarity is problematic from a socio-cultural perspective and more effectively aligns with a universal perspective. From a universal perspective, then, absolute communication identifies a division between technical and non-technical words, or rather, a singular communicative language that works across boundaries. In contrast, a socio-cultural perspective would identify that what counts as clarity alters across disciplinary boundaries and even is negotiated in multiple forms within a single community. Thus, the universal notion of absolute communication is challenged by a socio-cultural perspective because each community would entertain unique modalities of communication. In turn, defining clarity as transmitting a message that anyone may understand is perhaps not a theoretically fruitful way to imagine clarity in writing.

As writing studies have demonstrated, the universal philosophy of absolute clarity is a combination of taking the shortest distance between two points and of how well the content fits the language (Abbott & Eubanks, 2005; Eubanks, 2010; Reddy, 1979). In research on the Conduit Metaphor—or the observational belief on good writing in which a message can be simply transmitted—clarity has been identified as needing these techniques of short distance, "Directionality of Communication," and of content fit, "Language as Container" (Abbott & Eubanks, 2005, p. 192). Thus, these concepts are accomplished by finding the shortest distance between two conceptual points and as entertaining an efficient "word-content ratio"—using the least number of words to

explain the content (Abbott & Eubanks, 2005, p. 192). These universal elements are commonplace in criminological writing instruction when considering communicating to others:

> *Crisp*…that's the opposite of verbose, sometimes I said flowery but also too wordy. Oftentimes you can read a paragraph and remove almost all of the adverbs and little content is lost and crisp is really getting the point across as effectively as possible and sometimes qualifiers and so on really detract from communication. I'm not saying there should never be an adverb or anything, that's not my point, but shorter is often clearer…you know it's challenging, it's easy to say what you should do, it's hard to actually do it in practice to find the difference between avoiding jargon—terms that are really unnecessary—from terms that do capture language; that is, the language being used by the experts in the field… sometimes [we] use terms that signify concepts in a way that we understand as professionals in the field. It might seem like jargon to an outsider but it really isn't (Author 17).
>
> It is not that they are better it's just said more *crisply* – in Criminology we would take 40 pages to express themselves and in Psychology, it is 10 pages and it is done – the same story is told it is just crisp (Author 20).

These criminological scholars individually draw from the universal perspective by using physical analogies to indicate the process of finding the shortest distance between points as "crisp." Crisp seems to offer a physical analogy to package clarity in terms of the Conduit Metaphor where communication should be identified by a fit of the content and the shortest distance between points.

Both authors contend that current criminological research lacks this key feature because writing is often overly verbose and wordy. Both insist that a reduction of unnecessary words that fail to add meaning to the paper would increase the clarity of the paper because being brief is equated with being clear. Overall, authors contended that

clarity is achieved by this concept of "word-content" ratio and reducing the distance between points through words similar to "crisp," in which characteristics such as redundancy and length, the clear and complex balance and organization can produce crispness and other qualities that endow any document with clarity. Author 17 additionally takes the efficient word-content approach to clarity in the previous excerpt. Following up notions of crispness, Author 17 draws a division between necessary words and unnecessary words in which some words fail to capture meaning more effectively than others. Across the sample, individual authors in criminology often define clarity and communication in terms that align with the universal perspective and the Conduit Metaphor.

In addition to the physical analogy, scholars also demonstrated that a central principle of absolute communication, or clarity in criminology, involved the feature that one's writing could speak to anyone, regardless of the respective discourse community. This notion of absolute communication draws from a universal perspective. That is, while the language is constructed by, and used colloquially between members, criminological writing should also make sense to common, lay individuals and non-experts: "It's good to have somebody who's not an expert in that specific topic read it and make sure that makes sense to them because I think that it should make sense to most people" (Author 28). Ironically, the sentiment that a specialized and technical language should make sense to most people represents a conflict with socio-cultural research on writing studies that demonstrate that writing, syntax, grammar, meaning and style shift across discourse communities and are packaged and decoded differently. The sentiment that criminologists should speak to an ill-defined group outside the criminological

community—or a non-audience—represents a dilemma of speaking to any potential audience using a mode of communication that was developed for the criminological community.

> It depends on the audience you are writing for…but I do think when one writes with clarity it should be understood—maybe not the methods or results because there is not experience with those types of issues but with the introduction and conclusion…I think that a person who doesn't know much about one of the issues [should] be able to pick it up and understand… (Author 8).

In a similar sense to the "language as container" element of the Conduit Metaphor and universal perspective, being able to communicate clearly uses precision as a gauging tool of whether text can be decoded by non-audiences. Similar to assessing whether the word-content ratio is effective, criminologists indicate that accuracy of a word is paramount: "I haven't been an academic all my life but I find academic writing tedious. But that doesn't mean we have to sacrifice accuracy and precision. But there is an enthusiasm for jargon and in some fields of criminology that I find to be a tad wordier" (Author 33). Precision of words is considered important because of the prevalence of interpretation that occurs within the transmission of messages. Thus, scholars recognize that words can be fuzzy and difficult to decode:

> Abstract concepts…which may be interpreted in different ways by different people—even things like delinquency—what do I mean by that? Especially in the context of a paper—maybe I am talking about substance abuse, and within substance abuse maybe I am really just talking about alcohol. So just being very precise in the terminology goes hand in hand with clarity…I think it is easy to fall back on academic jargon and phrases that we are trained to use (Author 5).

The recognition that "plain" language is more effective to speak to lay audiences, identifies the common universal perspective in which academic jargon is cloudy, murky and obfuscating whereas purely observational language allows one to palpably see meaning in the words.

As scholars have noted, a central feature of clear writing from a universal perspective is criminology identifies that importance of using plain language to confer specialized knowledge across community boundaries. Thus, communicating becomes a difficult task of blurring the lines of specialized, technical knowledge and pure observational language; that is, communicating specialized knowledge without using specialized language. Or rather, in line with universal principles of taking specialized knowledge out of its specialized adornment and re-draping it in standard, observational language: "You need to find ways to translate your research into words that a lay audience can understand…So I mean I think in criminology and criminal justice, just as in other specialized fields, we have a specialized language but I think it's incumbent on us to explain what those terms mean…" (Author 35). In this sense, clear scientific writing is discussed as separating science and rhetoric (Miller, 1979), where complicated words are seen as bloated, loaded language or the production of false knowledge that obscures reality (Cox & Roland, 1973). Thus in line the universal view of social science writing, absolute communication identifies that "knowing is seeing" (Abbott & Eubanks, 2005, p. 192) where complex material can be distilled into simple words that transcend community boundaries. In line with Rorty's (1978, p. 143) first way of imagining language, the universal perspective suggests that clarity involves "a vertical relationship of representation and what is represented."

By drawing from a universal perspective, then, scientific language becomes distinct from other rhetorical and interpretive forms of language, and rather, is understood as specific language designated as an objective presentation of scientific reality in which all audiences should be able to "look at" (Lanham, 2006) facts through an unaltered windowpane (Miller, 1979). Lanham (2006) draws the distinction between audiences that "look at" versus those who "look through" specialized technical language. While lay audiences are often limited to looking at specialized language, trained technical audiences look through the language to the meaning within and underneath. Thus, those trained in the field metaphorically decode language relative to the studied object in a way that the layperson cannot. Yet from the universal perspective where the construction of knowledge is couched by the ability to communicate with absolute clarity to (non)audiences the distinctions between "looking at" and "looking through" become blurred. Take for example the following excerpt from an interview:

> There is a false belief that sophistication is equivalent to being correct, scientifically correct. We extend legitimacy to sophisticated positions or sophisticated arguments that are sometimes even pathologically inconsistent, but since they are stated in a way that seems right we extend credibility to them frequently…I would rather know clearly the nuts and bolts that I am looking at. I would rather see an idea stated distinctly and clearly and honestly than one sort of loaded with sophisticated language. It is okay to be clear, you don't have to write in the language of professors—it is not English literature, you know? You know, I think a lot of graduate students don't get the message, clarity above all else (Author 15).

Drawing from the universal perspective and that the meaning in scientific writing should be instantaneously visible, the author identifies differences between clear words and blurry words; or purely observational language versus rhetoric. This blurring of lines

between specialized knowledge and observational language—or between "looking at" and "looking through"—insists that words themselves add nothing to the science. From this view, complexity is seen as a writing trick: "It seems to be jargon almost for the sake of it and the idea of finding some sort of secret language that one must be initiated [into] through eight years of graduate school can understand" (Author 33). Within the discourse community scholars draw from the universal notion of clarity as communication to provide tension to the production of a secret academic language, where unchecked rhetoric runs rampant and buzzwords create a division between plain language people and those who hold the key to technical, scientific language; between the public and ivory-tower academics:

> I recently went on this website and it is called Real Peer Review and it just kind of makes fun of essentially feminist research, qualitative research, and postmodern research, and sometimes he will post the abstract. And sometimes the abstract, it is like what are they really saying? Like, this is not English—a person on the street may have no idea what is going on in this sentence. They may recognize each individual word, but strung together it kind of gets absurd…It just becomes a series of buzzwords and it is not really adding anything. It is just actually confusing and muddying the waters without clarifying stuff (Author 3).

At its core, authors individually identify clarity from a universal perspective, in which communication is a complicated task of writing a specialized text where (non)audiences can instantly "see" the meaning in the words: "since its origin, criminology has been a public or an applied discipline, there is no real point to our discipline if we are not in dialogue with practice, if we are not relevant to the real world" (Author 32). This blurring of tasks, where a document must be immediately communicable is seen to be a byproduct of being a relatively new field. Whereas older,

more developed disciplines and fields are seen to have divisions of labor in which communication is achieved through "translators," criminology with its applied underpinning, is perceived to be required to accomplish this task from the start. A field like physics is seen as having the "benefit of 6 levels of engineers in between that are going to translate our research before we bring it into practice" (Author 32). Physics writing then is perceived to follow a distinct division of labor; where knowledge is created in a specialized manner and then translated into a usable form for practitioners and the public through multiple authors. In contrast, criminology is seen to lack these "translators." Thus, central to the field's survival, is that knowledge in criminology must be written in a form that is directly "seeable" or comprehendible, merging the divisions of labor into one phase: "I think in social science, everything is addressed to reach fellow faculty members but our job is to reach out to students, to reach administrators, people working in the field, and politicians and policy-makers. Which means we need to write clear but in enough detail that they understand" (Author 25).

In this section, we have seen that clarity in criminology is often defined as communication across symbolic boundaries. Further, we have seen that authors draw from a universal perspective on social science writing to define the most integral elements of writing in criminology. By reframing universal principles (i.e. absolute clarity) we can see that clarity in criminology is the difficult task of procuring "absolute communication." That is to say, that one's text should arise from specialized knowledge but be communicable in a plain lens to any discourse community. By using the Conduit Metaphor we have seen that these individual author quotes often fall in line with the universal perspective on social science writing. However, the next section juxtaposes

author definitions of clarity against one another to demonstrate that this central philosophical underpinning of criminology actually aligns more accurately with a socio-cultural perspective and demonstrates that clarity exists in multiple forms rather than homogenously, despite that we often draw from a universal perspective to when seeking explanations of clarity.

Complicating absolute communication in criminology. The previous section demonstrated the quality of clarity in criminology and how productive scholars often draw from a universal perspective on writing to define the features of clarity. However, a discussion of the theoretical tension between a universal and a socio-cultural perspective identifies that although we think of clarity in a universal capacity that it is more accurate and fruitful to imagine the concepts as existing differently and heterogeneously within the field. In turn, it is the case that even individuals contain interpretively different conceptions of what clarity is and this manifests as consequences for what is considered good writing. Thus, this section demonstrates that when we put these universal sentiments in a writing studies framework that imaging writing from a universal perspective may not be particularly helpful

In the previous section in which it was found that clarity in criminology is often defined as absolute communication, Author 17 discussed how crispness was an important and influential factor of good writing in criminology. Crisp-ness involved using pure observational language, that elicited precision (word-content ratio) and a removal of redundancy (shortest distance between points). However, the author also addressed the complicated task of being clear and communicating across multiple audiences:

> You know it's challenging, it's easy to say what you should do, it's hard to actually do it in practice to find the

> difference between avoiding jargon—terms that are really unnecessary—from terms that do capture language; that is, the language being used by the experts in the field… sometimes [we] use terms that signify concepts in a way that we understand as professionals in the field. It might seem like jargon to an outsider but it really isn't (Author 17).

In a twist, the author notes that to outsiders many of the necessary words used in criminological writing lack meaning and may seem like "jargon." The author offers an intriguing sentiment that technical, scientific terminologies can be considered as jargon themselves by other audiences. In other words, the author provides the inquiry: how does criminological clarity come to terms with the need for scientific jargon for which other, outside audiences have no reference? Or to put the conundrum differently, when speaking to many audiences is it the case that scientific language is fundamentally incommunicable?

This complication illuminates the difficult and fluid nature of receiving a word as meaningful, necessary or clear. As the author notes, the meaning and validity of the word are often relative to the particular discourse community, where criminologists are able to decode a word and an "outsider" lacks the means to interpret the word in its context:

> In addition, though, it's interesting how different journals can have different rhetoric. This especially is the case when you're spanning areas. For example, I'm writing for Sociology it would be very different than for a Public Health journal…when you're thinking of publishing in journals it's a good idea to do your homework, you know you read some of it beforehand you get a sense of what is the rhetoric of the discipline (Author 17).

In this sense, whether a word contains the effective amount of meaning, or fits into its container, is in relative flux between discourse communities and is further complicated

by the notion that authors maintain a creative element of producing engaging writing through turns of phrase or by linking storylines to broader discourse community canons.

Indeed, authors noted dilemmas in discerning—from a universal perspective—the lines of clarity between "plain" language, necessary scientific jargon and unnecessary jargon. As Miller (1979, p. 613) has noted about the difficulties in drawing a line between technical and non-technical, or necessary and unnecessary words: "Definition based on content seems at first obvious and then unworkable—no one is prepared to say which subjects are 'technical.'" In this sense, different interpretations of what counted as jargon or necessary versus unnecessary language created various definitions of clarity across conversations with authors. Although most authors believed that clarity was not at the expense of science, at times, navigating the lines between them meant that increasing communication equaled sacrificing scientific language, and vice versa. This complicated task resulted in differing conceptions of what counted as clarity and in which contexts:

> Tailoring the writing to different audiences is very tricky. So for example, a recent paper that just got published to the [crime topic], we knew that this paper would reveal some of the tension and what we did that was quite the opposite is to be able to write in a manner that would appeal to more of a general audience and that is what we do. And even after the paper was written we were criticized for being overly technical—they wanted it for broader audiences but that is what op-ed and things like that are for—but in any case—being able to not just talk to five other criminologists who were in the room and being able to communicate that with other people (Author 31).

In this case, the author felt that reviewer and journal stipulations, to further reduce technical aspects of the piece would force it to move genres (e.g. the removal of technical aspects made it an op-ed piece, not a scientific article); but for the reviewers, speaking to the public meant the omission of complicated, technical science jargon terms that the

public would not grasp. In this particular circumstance, according to the author, transparency came at the expense of the scientific language Thus, as posed here, scientific language is at odds with communication. In this sense, the author felt that the removal of technical terms—that articulated data and analysis—transmuted the writing into an opinionated commentary that typically falls outside the boundaries of legitimate scientific inquiry. In this sense, in some cases improving communication was seen as hiding or obscuring the science taking place behind the scenes. This also identifies an underlying problem with the contemporary universal thought on clarity; that is, often scholars do not agree on what is clear or unclear, and that rhetoric can be seen as improving clarity whereas scientific language can be seen as being organically obfuscating (i.e. engaging writing or storytelling).

Beyond these experiences with clarity differing by person, one of the more surprising findings in this research is the extent to which the conversations offered the overarching belief that criminology is perceived to fail at producing clear writing. Indeed, despite that clarity was the most common conceptual underpinning of the characteristics of good writing, the interviewed authors seemed to agree that generally, criminology was not overly concerned with communication and that criminological articles regularly avert clarity: "But I don't think Criminology particularly emphasizes clarity of exposition" (Author 22). This is a particularly strange and contradictory finding. As chapter 3 of this project demonstrated, influential scholars retain high social status community positions—such as editors of premier journals in the field. Thus, as "literacy brokers" (Lillis & Curry, 2006) a substantial amount of the research produced in criminology is directly or indirectly influenced through them or mimics other fields that were often noted as

containing a more effective clarity and crispness (e.g. psychology, the physical sciences). From a socio-cultural perspective, the interpretation that criminology lacks clarity despite it being the fundamental center of definitions provided by elite scholars in interviews alludes to the socio-cultural process of individual interpretation of clarity as a literate concept.

This paradox also demonstrates the consequence of imagining writing from a universal perspective. From a universal perspective, clarity is seen homogenously as using plain language to communicate across community boundaries. However, from a socio-cultural perspective, writing practices—such as clarity—are byproducts of enculturation between individual author and discourse communities. Thus, thinking about writing from a universal perspective disguises the extent to which communication is interpreted differently across individual scholars and small sub-sets within disciplinary communities. Thus, this division, in imagining writing as universal has consequences for communication and clarity. For example, socio-cultural differences in clarity definitions may be interpreted from a universal perspective as being unclear or of "bad" writing. Since a universal view of writing separates rhetoric and technical language, it could be the case that the use of specialized language is constantly individually decoded as a failure to provide a clear view of reality:

> And, as a field, we do not write well if we do not have influence over practitioners. So if I give my graduate students a task of writing thirty pages with some (multivariate) level statistics, they can do that no problem at all because they've been super well trained. If I want them to write two pages in English, that I will give the [City] police commissioner, that doesn't have any statistics in it then everybody starts struggling at that point. So in the discipline, we've done a terrific job training people to write in verbose, scientific, criminological jargon, and we've

> done a terrible job teaching people to communicate with decision-makers and policy-makers (Author 33).

As the scholar notes, training in criminology has made upcoming scholars incapable of speaking to audiences that exist outside of the discourse community because of its specialized nature; or rather, incapable of speaking in criminological terms outside of criminological language, vernacular and dialogue. Yet, the difficulty of this task should be understandable. Upcoming scholars learn a specialized language where they "look through" nomenclature to meaning, and are concurrently tasked with converting these concepts that carry scientific debates to a common and public vernacular that anyone may "look at." The interdisciplinary nature of criminology means that scholars are nearly always disparately enculturated and have different background experiences, which arm scholars with unique coding and decoding protocols for understanding what counts as clear.

This socio-cultural framework could lend some explanatory power for why criminologists think clarity is most important; and simultaneously, the most lacking feature in criminological writing. In the writer-reader interaction, the reader will certainly have different background characteristics and personal experiences than the writer and use different interpretive tools to decode the information. This creates a lens where speaking within criminological terms is ironically evident of bad writing:

> I don't think criminology is [concerned with clarity]! I think if you pick up the most recent issue of Criminology and ask somebody on the street to read the articles and make sense of it. Or if you ask like from a strict writing standpoint, I find that most of the articles written to be dreadfully difficult to read. Not that they are not important and that they don't have findings or not that I can't read them, that's impossible. To me, the best research is the research that is done well and communicated effectively. I

> feel that right now you could do great research and not communicate it very effectively and still get published. You don't have to be a good writer to be a criminologist! You don't [even] have to be a decent writer to be a criminologist (Author 38).

From the socio-cultural lens, then, clarity is something that does not sustain a consistent structured definition in criminological writing but varies based on the field and individual using it. In other words, clarity is often felt rather than known and bears a level of "automaticity" (Pare, 2011)—where scholars have internalized the feeling of clarity over years of experience—rather than containing a structured definition:

> I wish I could give you my sort of plan of clarity but I don't have it written out because it is sort of when I see it I know, or when I read it I know. But what I would say is that I always try to use words that most people would understand. So instead of using a more academic word or a fancier word, to show off that, I know what that word means, just use words that people use in everyday conversation (Author 2).

By packaging this clarity tension within a writing studies theoretical model used in this project, this is perhaps indicative of the extent to which clarity is interpretive rather than purely observational, and has different meanings for different authors with interdisciplinary backgrounds and experiences. Thus, this section identifies that although criminology often discusses writing philosophy from a universal perspective, that it may be more beneficial to imagine writing from a socio-cultural perspective. Additionally, imagining and discussing writing from a universal perspective may have negative consequences for the field as authors are trained to recognize different writing as fundamentally unclear and incommunicable. The following section discusses a second common underpinning of writing among discussions with scholars, creativity.

Creativity from a Socio-Cultural Perspective

The previous section identified the most common identified underpinning of criminological writing as *clarity*. Specifically, authors define clarity as boundless communication to audiences. As shown, discussions of absolute communication in criminology demonstrated that scholars would often draw from a universal narrative and imagine writing from the Conduit Metaphor. However, this study identifies that it may be more fruitful to imagine writing in criminology from a socio-cultural perspective. As discussed in Chapter 2, the socio-cultural perspective identifies that individual text choices are often situated within larger disciplinary conventions and socio-cultural assumptions of science.

In turn, the socio-cultural perspective utilizes the concept of discourse communities to suggest that disparate conventions and assumptions may be constructed in particular academic communities (Porter, 1986; Swales, 2016). However, contemporary revisions of the discourse community concept indicate that even single discourse communities are heterogeneous, providing unique conventions and literate interpretations for small sub-sets of scholars and even individuals. In this contemporary revision of discourse communities, authors experience socialization to multiple discourse communities to formulate unique styles of writing. In this sense, Rorty (1978, p. 143) offers a second way to imagine writing, in which individual writing style and one's interaction with multiple discourse communities results in a "culminating reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation." Thus, individual scholar's identity is carved out between from triangulated points in-between text choices and discourse communities to which they have come in to contact.

From this socio-cultural perspective, then, it is perhaps unsurprising that although authors often originally drew from a universal perspective that they also identified unique and individual creative factors that produce good writing. In contrast to clarity, creativity emerged across conversations as a central thematic principle underlying writing in criminology. Unlike clarity, creativity is organically heterogeneous and is by its nature individual, personal and unique. Thus, this section provides further support that it is fruitful to imagine writing from a socio-cultural, rather than a universal perspective.

When one paints a picture of technical writing in criminology, creativity is not the first thing that would come to mind. Rather, criminology, and other social sciences laud good technical writing that falls in line with universal principles. As Bern (1987) notes about technical writing that it "should be economical for the same reason that a drawing should have no unnecessary lines, and good writing should be streamlined in the same way that a machine is designed to have no unnecessary parts, parts that contribute little or nothing to its intended function" (p. 13). It is alluring to believe that technical characteristics comprise a formulaic and mechanical product that we all construct in conformity; or that mechanistic and utilitarian formulae, such as absolute clarity, give upcoming scholars and graduate students a blueprint for producing good criminological writing. To echo Author 29 from earlier in this chapter: "I don't know if someone can be made eloquent but they can be made clear." The central claim and power of drawing one's explanation from a universal perspective are that all scholars, new and otherwise, can accomplish absolute technical aspects of scientific writing because they are material, mechanistic and observational.

Miller's (1979) writing on windowpane theory demonstrates how technical writing is devised as an instrument. In a similar way that positive science uses experiments and analytical procedures external to the individual to provide support for hypotheses, writing is often envisioned as a subjective and messy extension of the individual that impedes the validity of objective facts about the real world. Thus, as Miller (1979) states, technical writing is simply a "series of maneuvers for staying out of the way" (p. 613). This sentiment is represented in criminological writing through many of the already discussed techniques and beliefs; that is, the text should be organized in a neat and linear fashion, sentences and paragraphs should use the shortest distance between points, and words should be judged to be entirely necessary, precise and above all, communicative. From a universal perspective, the function of all of this is used to remove the individual from research in order to objectively let the facts speak for themselves.

Many illustrations of technical writing have been recorded where the individual is instructed to remove themselves from the text for fear of tainting or packaging the text in some capacity. For instance, social science writing guides—predominantly coming from the universal tradition of social science writing—have indicated the limited role that writing should play in the course of research, including the multiple characteristics that it should exhibit: "objective, impartial, unemotional, impersonal, dry, clear, direct" and so on (Miller, 1979). Additionally, guides on technical writing have regularly eschewed the existence of creativity in technical writing: "Such creativity is hardly more interesting, but it is certainly more confusing. In scientific communication, it can be deadly. When an author uses different words to refer to the same concept in a technical article—where

accuracy is paramount— readers will justifiably wonder if different meanings are implied" (Zanna & Darley, 1987, p. 195). In contrast, however as renowned rhetoric and style scholar Lanham (2006, p. 8) has noted, packaging text is inevitable: "In the larger sense, if you think that attention is the necessary intermediary in an economics based on information, then you have to make a fundamental assumption or observation. And that is that information always comes in some kind of package…But packaging is inevitable. You can call this, on one hand, style, which is what it is..."

In contrast to the universal perspective, this project has uncovered that the best writers use a considerable amount of creativity in the writing of research. As Becker's (1996) famous piece notes—which considers the epistemological differences (or lack thereof) between styles of empirical investigation—imagination (or creativity) is central to producing good research:

> ... but what makes his work outstanding is not that he uses some particular method or that he follows approved procedures correctly, but that he has imagination and can smell a good problem and find a good way to study it. Which is to say that telling good from bad is not as simple as it appears. It's easy enough to tell work that's done badly and to tell how it was done badly, and where it went off the track. But that in no way means that it is possible, in any version of social science, to write down the recipe for doing work of the highest quality, work that goes beyond mere craft (Becker, 1996, p. 66).

Although Becker is discussing research more generally, his sentiment nonetheless parallels many of the most influential criminologists' assertion that emerged in this research; namely that creativity is a core aspect of producing good criminological writing. Despite commonplace narratives in the field indicating that technical writing is a clear and impartial window of which to see objective and observable facts, many of the

conversations with top scholars indicated that producing good writing created a murky line and conflicting tension between attaining universal skills, such as absolute clarity, and using creativity. Characteristics considered important—such as *engaging* turns of phrase and *storytelling*—were undeniably indicative of creative elements unique to the individual author. Even discussions of clarity indicated that clear writing is a game of using ingenuity to figure out the best ways to say complex concepts in the most direct manner. All of this indicates that good writing is about communicating in creative ways that others do not think about or saying something in ways that others could not. That is, the authors often regarded as the clearest often also were regarded as the most independently creative, offered the most personalized writing and provided the most engaging text to read. This complication demonstrates the extent to which good writing is less universal than expected through conventional philosophies on technical writing. Put differently, clarity in good writing is unveiled in the difference between author writing styles instead of the similarities.

The remainder of this section identifies the heterogeneous nature of creativity from a perspective of the most influential writers in criminology. That is, individual authors provide a narrative that suggests they are socialized or enculturated by their unique sub-disciplinary factions to tell stories in their work differently than other sub-disciplinary sectors (i.e. critical criminology versus bio-social criminology, etc.). The key mechanism identified by authors in creativity was interpretation. Authors depict that interpretation in writing social science narratives provides an opportunity to tell unique stories about criminological phenomena that fall in line with enculturated experiences across different discourse communities.

Criminological creativity in discourse communities. A prominent aspect of this project was to discover what writing brings to the table in the course of research. If it is the case—from a universal perspective—that writing gets in the way and is an unfortunate part of the process of discovering and recording observable facts about the world, then why use it at all? What is it that words, sentences, and paragraphs bring to the table in the course of research? This was the mildly unpopular question asked in the course of interviews. Scholars demonstrated a range of answers, mostly hovering around disdain for the idea of reverting to more basic bullet-point type formats for reporting and presenting findings by eliminating the use of formal writing practices. If absolute clarity and communication is the central universal underpinning of good writing and too much writing obfuscates the truth, perhaps it is beneficial to distill writing to the bare essentials.

Although this was not a popular idea, it is notable to mention that the most influential authors deemed the current state of the length of articles in criminology to be excessive. That is, authors typically thought criminology articles were too long and could benefit from stripping down and shortening in length. This was primarily attributed to extensive literature review sections where reiterating the fundamental basics of well-known theories was seen as redundant. Sentiments on article length were typically in line with Author 33: "Most journal articles are about twice as long as they have to be…But, yeah, we could certainly do with shortening the length of some of our journal articles. Maybe not to half. The medical field has done a nice job of not sacrificing the quality of the research but actually having journal articles that have a length that is a little bit more palatable."

But it leaves behind the inquiry, when is brevity too much? That is, would scholars agree that writing itself was unnecessary? For instance, articles could simply bare the data on the page and let the reader come up with their own interpretations. Or rather, articles could simply be reduced to bullet-point type formats where each point could briefly describe the purpose, findings, and implications. Unexpectedly, however, authors seemed to disagree with this notion that one could distill science into bullet-points or lack writing entirely. Like Becker's comment about the potency of imagination in research, it was made clear by authors that mechanical construction, formula, and brevity in writing is not enough to be a good writer in criminology:

> Well, again I think it goes back to telling a story and I don't think bullet points tell a story. You know the thing about PowerPoint's at a conference where someone is simply reading those bullet-points, as opposed to someone who either has no PowerPoint or has a PowerPoint presentation that is very sparse and then the individual making the presentation tells a story about the research. And I think that's what writing does, it enables us to explain and say 'well, yes one could interpret it this way but one could also interpret it this other way.' And that's hard to do with bullet points. Those kind of contradictions and inconsistencies, and I think we would oversimplify our work if we were to reduce it to a set of bullet-points (Author 35).

As the previous author notes about using storytelling, the concept of interpretation indicates something interesting about writing scientific narratives. Despite reigning universal notions of "getting out of the way" and the mechanical aspects of objective writing, the author retains a choice about the presentation and packaging of the scientific narratives they produce. Like, Lanham (2006) suggests, telling a story in science involves interpreting the data and packaging the story in an individual manner. Thus, in contrast to a universal perspective unique interpretation is a fundamental principle of good writing.

Yet, how does one make interpretive choices in the packaging of their text in the course of criminological writing? The following quote is a response to proposing to reduce formal writing to bullet-points:

> I don't know, that doesn't sound very analytical to me. That sounds very prescribed, yeah I probably wouldn't like that. [*Interviewer*: *What wouldn't you like?*] No, it's because you wouldn't have a voice. You wouldn't have your opportunity to tell the story (Author 34).

In order to answer this prior question, many scholars used the concept of "voice." Thus, at times and often without prompt, authors used a concept of voice to indicate what writing brought to the scholarship. In writing studies, the concept of voice has been given much-studied attention (Matsuda & Tardy, 2007). The contemporary definition of voice involves authorship agency and choice, where the author can tell particular stories to indicate their own philosophical, theoretical and methodological orientations and align identity in the community: "I mean the concept of voice is who you are and what your scientific areas are, are defined by the way we write and way we think about issues. So that's important for people to tell" (Author 34). Interestingly, authors sometimes employed a second definition of voice that was not simply about author identity but about the identity of studied subjects. That is, a second type of voice is one that is given to others, "Well, you know, by storytelling—I guess I would use a different descriptive term—I would say the voices, by giving credence to the voices of criminal justice professionals, victims, and offenders" (Author 35). In this version of voice, academics have the power to illuminate narratives that are hidden from populations that have no forum for discontent.

Authors often indicated that voice is evident of one's particular sub-disciplinary discourse community. Thus, the concept of voice indicates that one's perspective is garnered from their entrenched theoretical and methodological orientations, of which informs what type of voice they may have or what type of story they may tell: "I think some disciplines have particular voices, but you can't get away from a collective voice within a sub-discipline, environmental criminologists have a voice, the theoretical criminologists have a voice that I don't understand, yeah so I think the sub-disciplines have their voices" (Author 33). In this sense, voice identifies an individual's connection to collective discourse communities. In these quotes, authors suggest that one's identity alignment with particular sub-disciplinary factions within the criminological spectrum influences the type of story they tell through the writing. Thus, socialization between distinct sub-groups within criminology will have different styles of writing:

> Well, we should have different voices because we have different perspectives. I mean the concept of a voice is really tied to people's perspectives or narratives that they want to tell about something. [*Interviewer: So we all kind of tell the story in a different way?*] Um... no, we tell it from the areas we are interested in. So if you use a violence prevention lens, if you are a police researcher you might be interested in what role the police had-- so you talk about it from that lens--if you're into psychology--you might be interested in how it changes peoples cognition, or their thinking patterns. So it all sort of depends (Author 34).

The concept of voice indicates something interesting about writing criminological articles. In line with Becker's notion of imagination as a core element of research, interpretation is a core element of criminological writing. Voice supposed, at the least, that authors bring interpretation through writing, where data has a multitude of possible stories and the data do not speak for themselves. Voice, as a way to produce identity,

indicates that subjective author choices are important in writing scientific articles despite notions to the contrary in universal teachings. Thus, these sentiments from influential authors indicate that the best writers make text choices that align with their socialized training. These sentiments are heavily reminiscent of Fairclough's model of discourse, in which individual text choices are couched within larger disciplinary conventions and socio-cultural assumptions. In this creative and socio-cultural view, good writing entails authors that are speaking from an encultured perspective with the data, which exists in great contrast to universal considerations of simply getting out of the way of the data. From a socio-cultural view, data and results cannot be left without words, sentences, and paragraphs because, without them, they say nothing. They have no stories, no turns of phrase, and no voice.

Research, as the following author indicates, is a process of discovery through writing about the data:

> Yeah, it's a process of discovery and interpreting what it means. You know obviously, the writing itself is not generating new data but it may very well be generating new insight about the data, ways to think about it, stimulating different ways of doing analogies and potentially even collecting more data.....Your observations and interpretations of what has happened is a large part of the data. You know the natural scientist or some of the philosophers of science, I can't give you a quote right now or a name, but you know they talk about how facts are meaningless without some kind of theory. Well, when you're writing that's when you're taking information and beginning to process it in a way that makes it something. So there is a sense in which you know the writing, in so far as it's contributing to the interpretative meaning of something, is creating data (Author 17).

In contrast with technical writing guides and the universal notion of writing that often implores authors to get out of the way of facts, the previous authors indicate that the

researcher plays a considerable role in producing the interpretive meanings of the data through the text by aligning their interpretation with the discourse community. In this sense, scientific stories require the socialized intervention of the author to be aligned with the interpretive lens of the discourse community:

> …kind of like we were talking about earlier, not necessarily the gut-wrenching stories are essential, but if you don't have good writing the findings are going to sit there flat and nobody is going to get the drift of what they mean. It takes some pretty huge exceptions. But, you know, I'm not sure it's all that different across fields. You know, facts don't speak for themselves on many things (Author 18).

These authors illuminate that interpretation is an integral step of scientific inquiry, where one's sub-disciplinary perspective informs that type of interpretation that is used in the writing process. In this sense, the process of writing is a scientific step of creativity where ingenuity and intellectual bridge-making produce interpreted data:

> You can see someone saying what if you had tremendous findings and you just couldn't write. Isn't that fine if you write poorly but you have got these really interesting analyses to share with the world? On the other hand, if you have got the interesting analysis—the sense that our mode of communication is language—if it is poorly written, if it is not good writing, is it really going to be good analysis? It is a tricky one for me to imagine to separate the two…The findings are the lens to some limit. There are ways it can be interpreted and there are lots of different ways so the interpretation is itself a creative act that involves writing—that translation is part of it, you know? (Author 32).

As we have seen in this section, influential authors provide socio-cultural accounts that demonstrate a counter-narrative to the universal view writers often draw from to discuss scientific writing on the surface. Opposed to the universal view, then, the data in this section suggests that authors are socialized into particular discourse communities and they use interpretation to tell a particular story about the data. From this perspective, their

"voice" represents a connection between the discourse community and the individual identity choices of the author. The next section demonstrates that author creativity is more complex than simply aligning one's identity with a discourse community through text choices. Rather, the next section shows that an author's personal background, experience, and philosophies often intersect discourse community goals to forge unique writing styles.

Heterogeneous creativity. In line with a socio-cultural perspective, many authors noted that voice or interpretation in writing came from one's respective sub-disciplinary view. Thus, productive scholars suggested that one's "voice" emanates from an agency/structure connection between the author and the discourse community. However, in line with contemporary revisions of the discourse community concept, authors also presented a more heterogeneous view on writing style (Prior, 1998). A large portion of the most influential scholars demonstrated that interpretation comes from personal experience, from being different people, having different ways of thinking about the world, being in it and discussing it:

> I definitely think that there are different personalities to writing. You see that in fiction a lot, some people write, like Hemingway for example, but he was trained as a journalist, so he wrote in very declarative sentences as opposed to William Faulkner, whose sentences sometimes went on for a page or more. So yes, I definitely think there are different styles, personalities, whatever you want to call it (Author 35).

On a basic level, it was the general consensus that people simply do not write the same, or rather, that everyone writes differently. The previous author ties individual creativity to the individual differences in sentence structure between authors. These

creative syntactical choices have fingerprint-type elements to them where each author's contribution is unique to others:

> I think as a general rule of thumb, human life is very broad the diversity enriches the pool. So I think it absolutely is a positive thing that we don't think and write in the same exact way. Because then we are able to appeal to broader audiences, we allow then for discrepancies and disagreements. And that is where scholarly discussions come in. If we disagree that is the most important part" (Author 1).

Like telling stories, individuals could face the exact same expositional situation—with similar data and theory and so on—and interpret a story differently. The previous author places individual creativity in argument and stance, where different interpretations produce scholarly discussions. Flowing from the notion that authors have different interpretations, the author sees scholarship as the debate fomented from writing stories about similar data differentially:

> And so you might read 10 different studies and I read 10 different studies and we are both asked to write a literature review. Not only might we read those differently and not only might we come to different conclusions, but even if we read them the same way and we got the same logical conclusions about the articles—what they meant individually and aggregately—we are going to write about it differently and have 10 paragraphs about 10 different studies (Author 2).

On a larger organizational scale, the previous authors identify that individual creativity can play its part effectively differentiating one's broad organization from another. The author suggests that distinct authors would produce 10 completely unique paragraphs about the same information. The following author ties individual clarity as an analogy to creative presentation. Ironically paired with clarity arguments made earlier, an author can make audiences members more engaged, and thus increase clarity, through unique

presentation styles. Speaking differently about a topic is drawn as increasing audience engagement:

> So that is not just in terms of clarity but also our voice. So it might be easier to think about it in terms of presenting. Right, I remember the first time I went to ASC, I was like 'Oh I can't wait to see this scholar talk' and I'd go and they were boring people, they would read off a paper, there was no eye contact or change in the inflection of their voice or anything. Then there are others who are very good at speaking; they are captivating, they have their own voice—the content can be the same, even the words can be the same. But the delivery is very unique. The way in which they write, the structure would sort of mimic that parallel in terms of the writing might be very terse or it might be more engaging and the voice would certainly have a personality (Author 2).

In line with discussion of how different voices tell different stories, the previous quote introduces the notion that one's personality can, at the least, make a story engaging for the reader and encourage the reader to stay involved. Thus, the manner in which one interprets the data and constructs the story draws attention to specific elements and organizations of the data as alternative manners of packaging data highlight and promote different points.

Largely, this nuanced personality and presentation difference is deeply tied to one's view of reality. In other words, unique style involves seeing reality differently. This exists in stark contrast to universal perspectives in which writing is depicted as providing unaltered visibility to the same phenomena through the looking glass of language:

> There is a piece that is uniquely me…when I was in Grad school I did standup comedy. One of the things that I have learned is that comedians have a third eye where they just see the world differently and one of the things I have said about scholars that are really successful is that they also have that third eye. To where they see reality and or see things differently than everyone else and I think that it I

> something that can be developed over time but it is
> something that you have to have a strong desire to develop
> (Author 20).

This section has demonstrated that conversations with influential scholars suggest that writing works from a contemporary socio-cultural perspective, in which individual writing style is identified by a connection between an authors' sub-disciplinary socialization and individual experiences and philosophies. Through a mechanism of interpretation, authors pose different voices in manuscripts by making identity choices that are based on unique experiences of the individual. These sentiments offer a counter-narrative to the conventional and universal manner in which writing is often discussed.

Deviance in Writing: Rule-Following and Transgression

> There are several conventions in scientific writing.
> Some are useful, some not. But as with any style of writing,
> it is best to know the rules. That is so you can tell when you
> are breaking them (Van Way, 2007, p. 638).

It is neither by sheer force of will nor by magic that writing styles shift across history. Rather, it comes from the deviant creative ingenuity of scholars as they transgress conventions and literate assumptions of the field. From a universal perspective, importance is placed on following preconceived literate conventions and assumptions. In other words, as one author conceptualized it, as following the rules: "…if you want to get published, you have to follow the rules…" (Author 22). From a socio-cultural lens, emphasis is placed on heterogeneous nature of individual interpretation in writing as a creative pursuit. It is within this tension that we find the interesting socio-cultural point; that is, despite that influential authors often draw from a universal—or rule-following—narrative to explain writing many of them reported that creativity was found in breaking

the rules. Thus, an interesting consequence of this tension is found in writing deviance, in which accomplished scholars transgress the boundaries of universal expectations.

Although Van Way (2007) means the above quote in a rule-following sense—that is, one that knows the rules can follow them—it may be helpful to invert the meaning of the quote. In other words, knowing the rules and boundaries of writing allows scholars to step beyond them using creative elements. For Van Way, whose paper reflects many of the tensions in scientific writing that have been uncovered in this project thus far, scientific writing has particular rules or conventions that are not supposed to be transgressed. Instead, graduate students are supposed to be able to learn fixed grammatical and syntactical rules that, as a toolbox, they can apply to writing scientific manuscripts. Although this study has corroborated that criminological scholars at times parallel findings on technical writing—that is, technical writing should be objective, impersonal, unemotional, etc.—conversations indicate that they believe pushing the boundaries of those rules is important. In fact, scholars lauded other authors who were willing to say things in a clever way that no one else would think of or write (i.e. *Engaging* or *Storytelling*). Ironically, what made an individual author celebrated in the field was the ability to know where the borders of the rules lie and push beyond their limitations.

It should be noted that rule-breaking in writing is not as egregious as breaking disciplinary conventions, such as failing to use a particular style for an outlet (e.g. APA). Rather, rules come in a range of forms (tacit understandings versus explicit rules) and often deviance in writing simply means differentiating from the norm and its undergirding philosophy. When technical writing is about producing a mechanical and

formulaic presentation of fact—where impeding subjectivity distorts the vision of reality—to some extent, any degree of creativity gets in the way of the end goal and represents writing deviance to the norm. Thus, the central tension between following rules and breaking them comes from the notion that creativity is a central aspect of writing a scientific paper. Although creativity was found most regularly in themes of telling a story (e.g. where a story is about making connections) or in engaging work (e.g. turning a phrase), clarity was also concerned with creatively constructing a sentence so that a complex idea could be converted into an easily consumable sentence.

Although the general sentiment in technical writing is that less creativity results in more clarity, these are not always and perhaps even are rarely, demonstrated proportionally on an equal continuum. That is, it is not the case that less creativity always results in more clarity; in fact, many authors noted that high creativity was necessary for high clarity (as demonstrated in the *Clear-Complex Balance*). Indeed, clarity and science were not always palatable together; where (as in the earlier example) more scientific jargon conflicts with the need for high clarity. At times, clarity can be seen as a detriment to the integrity of the science and vice versa. Thus, writing deviance and rule-bending were often products of exhibiting great and ingenious creativity which is often regarded as counter-productive to technical writing (regardless of the actual level of clarity or the integrity of the science).

It was not simply that the best writers are writing renegades who were willing to overstep laws made in the community, but rather, that they knew where the laws were and could incrementally step beyond them and add to them creatively. Take, for instance, a quote used earlier in the engaging and compelling section:

> …or that we no longer consider that theory to be a leading theory—that could be a very academic way of saying it—but [Scholar] would say that 'we have moved that theory to the criminological waste-bin' and it gives the same point across. It is very direct and everyone knows what he means. But it is a more fun way of saying it, it is a more engaging way of saying it (Author 1).

The author notes that creatively finding a new way to get a point across is more engaging while still being direct. This type of accessibility and clarity is only possible within the creativity and ingenuity of the author, in which they found a way to bring excitement to the reader through word and phrasing choices. While many authors noted that being engaging in this manner was secondary to clarity, many conversations seemed to entangle the two:

> I review a lot of manuscripts and if the writing is not clear, it is hard to even get the manuscript to get past that and maybe give the manuscript a bigger shot, because they can't communicate clearly…What is the meaning of it all…if you understand what the person did and if it is written clearly, you know, it is like, 'okay, now I'm engaged and now I'm really going to read the manuscript closely (Author 13).

The notion that the best writers stretch beyond the rules and follow the rules offers a complicated picture of styling in criminology. As we have seen thus far, staying within the rules manifests in multiple ways. For instance, the notion that one must follow the rules (Author 22) is identified as being restricted by conventions ("We are restricted, we have to use certain terminology and conventions so that our readers understand it," Author 5), or sticking to the basic English grammar and syntax rules learned in grade school (Author 17). Thus, although authors regularly insisted that there are primary and absolute rules of writing that do not change, they simultaneously placed the practice of the best writers as those who do, in fact, defy those very boundaries:

> I think that is where you will find the hallmark of the best writers...they find a neat way to balance both of those concerns, they are very clear and they are very direct in the point they want to make but at the same time they are engaging and they find a new way to make the point and I think that is absolutely possible to merge the two.. (Author 1).

Scholars recognized the workings of technical writing as the removal of an individual's voice in many of the disciplinary conventions in the field:

> …there is a process way of writing, a kind of scientific way of writing where you don't use the first person—everything is kind of written in a passive voice. The procedures, this analysis, and it is like a robotic way of writing that you couldn't read out loud because nobody talks like that in the real world—we only write like that in scientific journals as kind of a pretense to objectivity and when you read the good writers there is much more of themselves in the writing. You read that—and there is someone there that is clearly human and you are reading a biased perspective but an honest perspective" (Author 32).

Considering these conventions were seen as impossible anyway (i.e. to remove one's humanity in their writing), many scholars chose to move beyond them through individual text choices. Much of the rule contention found in conversations with the most influential scholars were presented in this form, in which scholars followed structural disciplinary conventions while stretching beyond them through individual text choices and writing agency. Structural and more universal writing rules were seen as too large and too resistant to change. Additionally, they served a community purpose of aligning community members on a similar frequency for communication:

> ...but I think that it is also a good way to get something in a similar way so that readers will understand and get the same product, but you are right if every article looked like a Ford Focus people would be like 'meh.' So yes, I think it stifles creativity but on the other hand, our system was designed to do the peer review thing—consistency is done from following a set format.... (Author 25).

Rule transgression helps incrementally reframe current paradigmatic understandings of how writing should occur. As seen in the historical section of this dissertation, writing changes over time, and transgressing the rules produces an incremental and gradual change in the discourse community where an interactional process can morph or co-opt new rules. This is the changing and dynamic element of how writing occurs in the discourse community.

However, writing deviance can go too far and risk being seen as openly resistant to the community. Thus, writing change must appear to follow the rules, using small changes in writing choice, because the change in discourse communities is slow and gradual.

> I do think it limits things because one of the things is that, at least not in our field, but if you go outside the traditional confines of our traditional way of thinking the changes of publication decrease and it takes a long time for things to change. You may find yourself getting attacked you know? So that is the problem that it takes a while for things to change. If you do something too radical people are just going to be like 'huh?' I think this is interesting--have you seen the new motorcycles with one rear wheel and two front wheels--they are called a Trike...It's not catching on a lot because people are like 'I don't get it.' So that is the problem, the field keeps changing and evolving, but it is the analogy of the supertanker--you will never turn it on a dime...It's [change] incremental and you know, we do a lot more research then we used to in different areas but for whatever reason the writing style does not, I mean pick up any journal there will be minor cite changes but they all have the same format and style (Author 25).

As demonstrated in this section, breaking the rules is integral to composing a shifting and heterogeneous writing style in the criminological culture. Thus, contrasting the universal perspective rule transgression is demonstrative of the way that literature practices and concepts shift throughout socio-historical periods.

Conclusion

The overarching objective of this chapter has been to place quotes from influential authors within a writing studies framework, of which juxtaposes the universal and the socio-cultural perspectives. In this vein, this section has accomplished a few objectives. The first section identified a commonplace underpinning of criminological writing as *Clarity*. In this section, it became clear that clarity within criminology is often identified as communicating specialized knowledge to an array of untrained audiences. By using concepts from the universal perspective, multiple conceptual dilemmas were noted about imagining clarity as absolute communication.

In the second section of this chapter, a second commonplace underpinning of criminological writing—*Creativity*—was analyzed. In line with a socio-cultural perspective, creativity demonstrated the need for an interpretive voice in writing and suggested at first that authors' often attribute their voice to socialization within sub-disciplinary factions of criminology. Afterwards, it was discovered that authors also demonstrate how unique experiences and individual personality interceded writing style—falling in line with a contemporary and heterogeneous conceptualization of discourse communities from a socio-cultural perspective.

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION

This dissertation has accomplished two main goals. First, this dissertation has examined the unique terrain of literate practices and writing values in criminology. Chapter 5 illuminated the commonplace practices identified in conversations with the most accomplished criminological scholars. In turn, Chapter 6 investigated the conceptual criminological writing values of being a "good writer" as told by the most influential scholars. Second, this dissertation has demonstrated that the most influential authors often draw from a universal perspective when discussing literate practices, although in reality, their perceptions align more closely with a socio-cultural lens as we put their quotes in tension. In this vein, Chapter 7 situated underlying assumptions of criminological writing within a writing studies lens that juxtaposed a universal perspective and a socio-cultural perspective.

The purpose of the discussion section of this dissertation is to demonstrate implications that this work has for the field. A central message revealed in this dissertation is that we often draw from a universal narrative to explain literate practices, although it seems the socio-cultural perspective is a more fruitful lens to imagine writing. For example, a socio-cultural lens allows the possibility for us to engage and study writing practices in order to understand their unique terrain—as happened in Chapter 5 and 6 of this study. In tow, this discussion section considers how thinking about writing through a socio-cultural lens—instead of a universal lens—can be a more productive way

to consider writing in criminology. In contrast, the question becomes how is the criminological culture limited by imagining literate practices from a universal perspective?

The remainder of this discussion revolves around the prior questions and manifests in two sections: 1) theoretical implications for the field; and 2) practical implications for the field. These implications are drawn from the writing studies theoretical framework and from the findings of this study.

Theoretical Implications

Thinking about Criminological Style

Chapter 7 investigated the manner by which influential authors often draw from a universal perspective to explain writing. Yet, as quotes were placed in tension with one another it became clear that it is more accurate to imagine writing as being socio-cultural. This dissertation has used the term "style" throughout to excavate the assortment of literary practices and values identified as being important in criminology. In a socio-cultural framework, an individuals' style—the literate practices and values that culminate in a manuscript—is a unique byproduct of a heterogeneous structure/agency mechanism. The remainder of this section uses scholar quotes to demonstrate that styles in criminology are varied and individual.

When we consider style from a universal perspective, we can use Rorty's (1978) concept of "vertical" language as a heuristic tool. As Rorty (1978, p. 143) notes about verticality, language is seen to contain a direct "relationship of representation and what is represented" and where "scientific truth is center of philosophical concern." In this

hierarchal view, then, there are certain literate tools that allow direct representation of truth. If this is the case, Miller (1979) suggests, then, that there is not all that much to learn about writing. Writing becomes a simple process of learning rules that provide a clear lens to scientific truth. Thus, from a universal perspective, vertical style identifies how simple truth-revealing tools are generationally passed down. In contrast, we may consider style from a socio-cultural perspective. As Rorty (1978) notes, we may see language in a second manner—as "horizontally;"—or rather, as "the culminating reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation of our predecessors' reinterpretation." In this lens, tools of writing are reinterpretations that are negotiated in-between predecessors and individuals. In contrast to simply passing down literate tools, authors interact with conventions and alter them by merging individual author histories and philosophies. Thus, these considerations of vertical and horizontal language relationships, have implications for how writing style works within a structure and agency lens.

From a universal and vertical perspective, author style simply involves a process of passing down learned literate tools from a mentor to upcoming scholar. Thus, it seems if authors were to be completely in line with the vertical, universal perspective—to be objective and impersonal, sustained similar training and were writing to the same audience—authors would write in comparable manners. Even more so, if one's voice is based upon socialization into a sub-disciplinary perspective and authors are trained by similar mentors, then individuals from the same sub-discipline should write identically. Thus, in a universal perspective and vertical relationship, authors' writing practices would be all structured identically and there would not be much of anything to study.

However, according to the most productive scholars that offered *creativity* as a thematic principle of writing, this is certainly not the case. In contrast, if style was centered entirely on individual personality, then authors would write so differently that there could be no common frequency by which individuals could speak to one another. Terminologies and organizational structure would be entirely distinct between manuscripts and other readers in criminology would always be ill-equipped to decode the manuscripts of others. In this interpretive and heterogeneous view, style would be entirely based on individual author agency and idiosyncrasies. Yet, this does seem to be the case either.

Rather, to think of style horizontally is to imagine a structure and agency relationship. Although individual agency sprouts from individuals' experiences and personality, an author must also align their idiosyncrasies with expectations of the discourse community. Thus, reading the production of style from a structure/agency perspective, common expectations interweave a group of authors together as a discourse community. This provides similarity, commonality and collective identity.

> …agency in writing is fascinating. In that, a lot of writers, just like a lot of offenders and others, will say that the words just came to them. A lot of great writers stare at the typewriter until the muse takes over and inspiration hits and then you get into the flow and you know, there is a sense that it is not you at the keyboard, it is somebody else that is doing that writing. That is a little too romantic, there is certainly plenty of writing that feels very much like work and each word you can feel yourself sort of pulling out and squeezing out, but there are those moments of flow in good writing where it just takes over. The words feel like they are just coming out of somewhere else and those are great moments of writing. Often times, the best sort of material comes…I can work a day and a half on paragraph one and then suddenly in an hour and a half I can have the next 6

> pages done. That is what you wait for, is those moments where it all pours out (Author 32).

Returning to Fairclough's (1992) socio-cultural understanding of writing, he identifies that individual word choice is mediated by disciplinary conventions and larger philosophical assumptions. By using Fairclough's model, we may interpret this flowing feeling that words seem to come out of nowhere as a process of aligning one's idiosyncrasies with the discourse community; in which sitting at the "typewriter" and allowing the "muse to take over" is a process of finding a way to align to the targeted audience. On the flipside, scholars resonate with the authors' depiction of metaphorically pulling out words, as in "pulling teeth." In this way, this feeling can be identified as experiencing a gap between one's individual voice and the discourse community.

In a theoretical sense, this feeling can be described as a complicated connection between structure and agency in writing; the site at which individual voice aligns with the targeted community. Thus, writing becomes a complex connection between the individual and one's projected outlet (e.g. journal, publisher, conference, etc.). Indeed, some authors recognized this linkage between writing agency and writing structure: "Well I think that there is definitely a personality, despite that sometimes the journal editors try to knock the unique features out of manuscripts. But I think the uniqueness comes in the linkages to other literatures…I try to encourage my students to be more discursive and less terse" (Author 19). As the quote suggests, writing involves seeking a balance between unique characteristics in the writing and the expectations of the outlet.

However, authors note that a proliferation of outlets in the criminological spectrum provides a moving target for understanding how one aligns their agency with expectations. The difficulty of composing manuscripts is compounded by an ever-

increasing range of outlets and inter-criminology audiences. Just as there is an endless number of individual voices, there are a proliferating number of outlets with alternatively negotiated conventions:

> This might sound silly but I think to a certain degree writing is only going to get harder in terms of criminological and criminal justice research, because there are so many different outlets and the way in which people are writing for different outlets is going to change…and I imagine in the next few years we are going to have to come to grips with how do you write something that is relevant for a Facebook post or to the extent that people are using LinkedIn as a method of scholarship…How do you craft one thing for a certain environment over another (Author 24)?

The quote indicates how author voices must come to terms with the proliferation of outlets expanded by increasing technological advances in media communication. Conversations with scholars illuminated the complicated relationship between writing to the discourse community (or social structure) and finding one's voice within writing.

Thus, the graduate student discontent with learning the rules of writing can be understood through a complicated mapping in which individual personality must connect with a single set of expectations in one discourse community among many:

> I think it [IMRAD structure] isn't unimportant. I think it is part of that same attempt to appear scientific and part of the hard sciences...I think it depends on what you are writing also. This notion that you can't use yourself or you are supposed to be bias-free which we all know is impossible can be reflected in that structure. Half the time it depends, is it really necessary? If you are doing some, I don't know—a case study—is it really necessary to go through all the jargon in the study? Is it appropriate? To me, it takes away some of the fundamental arguments that you can be doing. However, there is a recognition that most journals expect that and you can get dinged by reviewers if you don't. So, it almost becomes a process where we are

> actively facilitating this nonsensical writing component (Author 12).

The previous excerpt demonstrates the struggle an author experiences between conventions that are meant to remove the author from the writing and inclinations to find one's voice at the same time. In line with the structure/agency perspective, we can see that individual writing style falls to an intermediate point between one's idiosyncrasies and the expectations of the discourse community. Thus, to imagine writing from a socio-cultural perspective—rather than universal—produces distance from imposing or learning a set of criminological stylistic writing rules that allow one to "write up" research, and instead, situates writing style as a contextual social and cultural interaction. In this sense, a re-imagining of writing would have criminology celebrate the plurality of the "styles" of criminology.

Academic Literacy as Identity-Work

Although the previous section focused on the production of individual style through a structure/agency model, it is also the case that from a socio-cultural view we can read academic literacy as an identity-building activity. From a universal perspective, writing consists of a set of formulaic rules that provide an objective view of scientific truth. As has been shown, this perspective involves allowing facts to speak for themselves and is predominantly concerned with removing one's subjective preferences from tainting scientific truth. Yet, this project has revealed that personality and individual creativity are integral elements of being a good writer in criminology. In this sense, from a socio-cultural lens, it may be fruitful to understand writing choices as

identity choices rather than as rules-maneuvers, as carving out identity-space rather than failures to conform to the rules appropriately.

As Starke-Meyerring (2011, p. 78) tells us that graduate students often demonstrate frustration with learning tacit practices in the field; such as, “What kinds of questions can and should be asked,” “How much and what kind of subjectivity (e.g. “I”) writers can or should project in their writing.” Failures to learn tacit practices are not seen as a complex process of aligning identity, but often as simply failing to understand writing rules. In turn, it becomes easy for the student to internalize these differences between individual writing and writing in the community as one’s own failure to understand straightforward principles (Starke-Meyerring, 2011). Writing for publication involves connecting individual philosophy with one’s audience, which can shift depending on the conventions of the community. This paradox provides explanatory power to the commonplace graduate student feeling that Starke-Meyerring (2011) found in which students write across different topics, with different faculty members, and for different purposes. These shifting contextual variables created a hopeless situation, in which students reported as such: "It was just kind of close your eyes and just give it to them and hope they don't tell you it's awful" (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 86).

Since writing rules and practices are constructed, consensus expectations are used as a way to demonstrate similarities, collectivity or cohesion among a community. By using particular grammatical, syntactical and lexical maneuvers an author may demonstrate that they align with the community or outlet to which they are writing. In line with the data from this project, an author would surely write differently in one community to the next (i.e. theory-based versus policy-based outlets, criminology versus

public health). Combining the negotiation of distinct lexical and syntactical maneuvers with sentiments from Leitch (1983, p. 145), that "a speaker must be 'qualified' to talk," we can understand that these maneuvers are cultural mechanisms that help establish a sense of belonging rather than a failure to engage hard and fast rules. In this sense, we can imagine these negotiated conventions as producing collective identity among the discourse community. As the following author poignantly suggests:

> I tell this joke to my graduate students, the one thing that the American psychological association has is the manual, [it] is the only thing that holds the association together. Look at how diverse psychologists are; you can have people who are behavioral research[ers] on pigeons and you have people in the field with observational research stuff – it is the only thing that holds them together is that manual that holds certain expectations as the same…" (Author 10).

Writing studies literature has demonstrated that we imagine writing as "identity-work" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014) to establish belonging, rather than a process purely devoted to developing technical skill. We can understand how this relates to identity by returning to Fairclough's (1992) model that situates text choices within the larger disciplinary and socio-cultural assumptions of the field. Thus, we can imagine writing as an identity-building task rather than a rule-learning task. By situating text choices within disciplinary and socio-cultural assumptions in the field, Fairclough demonstrates that authors align individual philosophies with the conventions of the community. Likewise, Kamler and Thomson (2014) indicate that writing a text and writing the "self" happen simultaneously. The scholar can identify themselves through text choices that position their academic identity within the scope of particular disciplinary sub-groups. In this way, the scholar is posturing how other academics see them in the community. Thus, text

choices allow scholars to write themselves into the field by coordinating their text choices with philosophies of the community.

From this identity-work lens, writing agency can be understood as "self-hood, motivation, will, purposiveness, intentionality, choice, initiative, freedom and creativity' (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998, p. 962) rather than failure. By interweaving personal history and experiences of the new scholar within community practice, the text can come to represent identity-work as "highly personal, creative genres…some of which complement—even transgress—traditional norms of standard academic discourse(s) such as those requiring that research articles following the structure of introduction, methods, results and discussion commonly referred to as IMRAD" (Duff, 2010, p. 175). In other words, scholars conduct identity-work by creatively merging individual text choices with norms of scientific discourses. In this sense, a scholar may interweave personal histories and experiences with other discourse communities while simultaneously lining up with the conventions of their target audience.

Thus, identity-work involves finding ways to position one's self alongside the collective identity of the community, but also produces individual identity by creatively bringing new textual elements. Since meaning behind writing is constantly evolving due to intertextual choices, the individual author is helping inscribe new connections into the criminological lexicon through dialogue with the community (i.e. mentoring, writing, reading, speaking, etc.). Thus, as Michael Halliday notes:

> [C]reativeness does not consist in producing new sentences. The newness of a sentence is a quite unimportant—and unascertainable—property and 'creativity' lies in the speaker's ability to create new meanings: to realize the potentiality of language for the indefinite extension of its resources to new contexts of situation…Our most 'creative'

> acts may be precisely among those that are realized through highly repetitive forms of behavior (Halliday, 1977, p. 42).

In other words, as Porter notes, "the creative writer is the creative borrower" (1986, p. 37). The agency of writing is often found in the way the author may bring their own personal histories—manifesting as writing choices from other communities like text, syntax, grammar, and so on—into tension with the intertextual and consensus writing in their current discourse community that exists as their audience. For example, the use of the word "dosage" in criminology—primarily in evaluation research—heralds back to medical and psychiatry lexicons while also defining the term in the production of correctional programs. Additionally, by using the term "dosage" the scholar invokes particular aesthetic and identity choices about themselves. The individual scholar does not create a new word, but rather invokes a medical word to influence legitimacy, call forth elements of accuracy, and note the curative powers of the intervention or for some other reason.

This conceptualization of writing as individual and collective identity can help reframe writing as a social and cultural activity rather than universal. In turn, it may be useful to conceptualize writing skill as identity in order to help new scholars in criminology to think of publication as an attempt to align or bridge one's identity with the style preferences of a community. In line with the socio-cultural mode, Fairclough's (1992) model also identifies that individual text choices are made in connection with larger disciplinary conventions. In contrast to a universal view, these conventions are negotiated within discourse communities between members. In this sense, writing is a social enterprise in which style preferences promote membership in the community. Thus, the styles of communication—captured in Chapters 5 and 6—may be seen as the

stuff that glues the community together even more than the subject material, as writing is the process of socially and culturally intersecting with others.

By understanding a rejection of writing from a mentor or a journal outlet as identity differences with the community, one may diffuse the angst and frustration that graduate students and upcoming scholars feel in writing struggles. In a socio-cultural perspective, new scholars are becoming exposed to numerous communities and merging their background with pieces of those discourse communities in order to fashion individual author identity. For many scholars then, learning to write is about learning to bridge literate gaps by borrowing words and phrases, grammar, syntax, and lexicon. In this socio-cultural lens, writing differently is seen as evidence of belonging to alternative communities rather than a pathological failure to grasp basic rules.

Academic Literary Invention as Deviant Behavior

> **"…there is no reason why I can't solve something with my writing" (Author 29).**

One theme that strongly emerged from the data involved the role that interpretation played in the storytelling aspect of writing scientific manuscripts. At its core, this notion that data may be interpreted through writing strongly undermines the universal narrative where language is seen as a vehicle only to transmit knowledge. However, this suggestion that interpretation plays a primary role in the production of scholarship has interesting implications for how we think about the role of writing in science.

Reframing this sentiment within the ongoing theoretical narrative in this project, a universal perspective identifies that "writing up" research is simply the conversion of research practice into narrative form. This mechanistic imagination of writing identifies

that language is only the vehicle to disseminate knowledge, and perhaps, undermines the extent to which the most accomplished authors utilize creativity, interpretation and subjective packaging of information as a form of conceptual invention. From a universal perspective, rhetoric is considered unnecessary language and obscures scientific truth in writing. The notion of "writing up" research insinuates that once data is collected and analyzed the science process is completed. At this point, writing is a simple act of plugging variables into a linguistic formulaic expression. Thus, from the universal perspective, writing and research are seen as entirely separable items: "Right – I think uh – let me think about this for a second…. It is hard to separate good writers versus good researchers" (Author 40). In this universal view, there is nothing intellectually inventive about writing itself.

Yet, as one author demonstrated writing is the central feature of the work of an academic: "I don't know if it's a necessary requirement but I do always say that I think that about 97% of my job as a professor is writing" (Author 28). Surely, this author means that writing is commonplace because of the nature of the academic as a communicating agent of scientific knowledge. That is, an academic writes manuscripts but also constantly communicates with academic audiences or the public—in either speech or text. A professor may spend as much time writing PowerPoint slides for classroom instruction as writing manuscripts for publication. Beyond seeing writing as integral to the nature of the job, authors also provided some evidence that writing was a valuable intellectual stage of the research process. By looking again at a quote from Author 17, we can see that the writing aspect is a part of the conceptualization process where the idea is still congealing:

> I think that writing is a critical part of the intellectual exercise itself. There are many times when I've convinced myself that I had some brilliant thought and I've worked out a problem—an intellectual problem. "Oh, this is great, clear, clear as a bell to me." I've tried to write it up and I can't get it down on paper. That means that I haven't really thought it through as clearly as I thought and I didn't understand it as well as I thought I did until I had to put it in words, sentences, and paragraphs (Author 17).

Although the author believes they already have a kernel of an idea, the author attributes writing as the intellectual exercise, which produces valuable conceptual inter-connections. The author describes the writing process as an exercise to draw connections within one's conceptual framework: "You know, I didn't think of that before – thank you fingers. So yeah for some reason – something between the integration of my brain and fingers works a bit better for me than just my brain alone" (Author 7). A few authors commented on how the process of writing is a conceptualizing exercise itself, and thus, the paper and idea evolve to more than the sum of their parts through an engaging writing process.

Thus, from a socio-cultural perspective writing is seen as a creative process in which one can never get between words and the object. Outside a universal perspective, a socio-cultural view sees writing as containing humanist and inventive elements. Miller (1979) notes this central issue between universal form and socio-cultural invention below:

> The second feature of our teaching that creates a problem is the emphasis on form and style at the expense of invention. The collapse of invention as a rhetorical canon is complementary to the rise of empirical science. If the subject matter of science (bits of reality, inartistic proofs) exists independently, the scientist's duty is but to observe clearly and transmit faithfully. The whole idea of invention is heresy to positivist science-science does not invent, it

> discovers. Form and style become techniques for increasingly accurate transmission of logical processes or of sensory observations; consequently, we teach recipes for the description of mechanism, the description of process, classification, the interpretation of data...If we take this approach to form and style very seriously, there is not very much to teach in a technical writing class. Form and style become, in theory, as self-evident as content. No wonder that technical writing is a course that anyone can teach and no one wants to teach. But why is it that students have difficulty writing effective prose if all they are doing is transmitting a reality about which they know more than the technical writing teacher (Miller, 1979, p. 614)?

From a socio-cultural lens, an author interprets data by formulating a story. Reaching back to the storytelling theme in the findings, authors defined the concept as having a linear theme, with temporality and in which the author links the primary theme across discourse communities (i.e. other areas of writing and literature). Like identity-work, telling a story involves interpreting data through the amalgam of lenses (i.e. personal idiosyncrasies and discourse community conventions) that the author brings with them. Thus, storytelling involves an inventive capacity to package the narrative in a unique manner.

Although the sample of authors in this project largely use quantitative methodologies, this invention capability of writing is easier to imagine from a qualitative methodological perspective. In the course of qualitative research, an author examines data for patterns, categories, and typologies. In grounded theory, then, these patterns and typologies are indicative of underlying constructs that emerge from the data, whether social processes (Glaser, 1978; Corbin & Strauss, 1997), socially constructed meanings (Charmaz, 2014) or situational differences and paradoxes (Clarke, 2005). Yet, it is the procedures of qualitative analysis that demonstrate the power of writing interpretation in

research. Often, qualitative researchers begin with open coding data, in which they look for thematic patterns. This is often accomplished by writing phrases next to individual excerpts that capture observable patterns and emerging thematic categories. In the second stage, the original phrases that indicated observable patterns are reinterpreted and organized. In other words, qualitative researchers interpret the interpretations. Afterwards, these interpreted interpretations are conceptually mapped and demonstrate broad underlying, latent constructs where authors demonstrate action and relationships between thematic patterns.

Certainly, the central feature of this qualitative interpretation revolves around the process by which the author makes sense of, or gives value to, and packages the story. In writing interpretation, then, uncovering connections through the intellectual exercises of writing is central to the development of the research idea. In this same vein, conversations with influential scholars identified that quantitative-based studies also rely on interpretation to tell their stories. In turn, these stories are packaged based upon constructed definitions of phenomena, abstract disciplinary conventions, and personal idiosyncrasies. Reading literate practice from this socio-cultural lens, then, it becomes impossible to disentangle good research from good writing.

If there is no language that is not interpretive—and thus, epistemic—it becomes likely that we may never neatly draw a line between the place in which research ends and writing begins:

> You can see someone saying what if you had tremendous findings and you just couldn't write. Isn't that fine if you write poorly but you have got these really interesting analyses to share with the world? On the other hand, if you have got the interesting analysis—the sense that our mode of communication is language—if it is poorly written if it is

> not good writing, is it really going to be good analysis? It is a tricky one for me to imagine to separate the two…The findings are the lens to some limit. There are ways it can be interpreted and there are lots of different ways so the interpretation is itself a creative act that involves writing—that translation is part of it, you know? (Author 32).

Thus, drawing from a universal perspective to explain literate practices undermines the extent to which language is always representative of one's interpretive lens. More aptly, to echo Miller (1979), the universal perspective forecloses the scientific value of invention through writing and language. Thus, overall an important conceptual implication is the extent to which we imagine writing as capable of invention rather than communication. In this vein, invention as a tool for creating scientific narratives may benefit the field in more practical manners.

Taking these arguments under advisement, we can use writing studies theories to understand the inventive powers of writing deviance. That is, we can integrate the discrete body of writing studies with criminology to introspectively understand the negative implications of delimiting invention from a universal perspective. For instance, by looking to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on language, we may see that criminological writing precedes and delimits the possibilities of criminological knowledge, understanding evidence and methodologies, and interdisciplinary literacy by undermining writing invention and emphasizing rule-following. Seminal in linguistics, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis—also known as the "linguistic relativity principle"—has empirically demonstrated cultural differences in the ways distinct groups categorize or dissect the natural world through distinct grammatical or lexical differences. Take, for instance, Sapir's (Mandelbaum, 1963, p. 162) quote on the influence of differential grammatical and lexical categories on worldview:

> Human beings do not live in the objective world alone... but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.

From a Sapir-Whorf perspective, outlet attempts to devise technical from non-technical, good writing from bad writing, or clear from murky (crisp from un-crisp?) provide borders that limit the possibilities of literate exploration. As Wittgenstein has famously noted:

> One thinks that one is tracing the outline of the thing's nature over and over again, and one is merely tracing round the frame through which we look at it. A picture held us captive. And we could not get outside it, for it lay in our language and language seemed to repeat it to us inexorably (Wittgenstein, 1958, p. 49).

In this sense, a universal perspective would have authors molded as rule-followers where what is considered "sayable" (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 11) is repeated to ourselves inexorably, in a relentless cycle of communication rather than invention. In this situation, a universal notion of rule-following would have negative consequences for the field as following static rules about writing would emphasize communication of concepts in homogenous manners. Since as Wittgenstein notes, one cannot get between words and content, writing similarly about these topics would result in constructed borders of criminological knowledge, cultural phenomena and values on scientific inquiry (i.e. what counts as evidence, as good writing, as what types of questions can be asked, etc.).

Turning to the lessons of the French philosopher Deleuze (1995)—who has critically examined the power dynamics of communication and creativity in discourse—has noted that, "creating has always been something different from communication"

(Deleuze, 1995). By contrasting these two features of discourse—communication and creation—Deleuze (1995) have demonstrated that shared values in communication always have an oppressive effect, in which the presentation of information is centered around conforming to the worldview of the majority. In contrast, Deleuze suggests that writing, that is creative or inventive has a resistive, or deviant, quality to tracing hermetic borders on philosophy and knowledge. In a resistive capacity, then, invention comes to the forefront as the central purpose of literacy rather than communication.

These lessons from Deleuze (1995) demonstrate that writing deviance and the inventive utility fall in line with a socio-cultural framework rather than a universal. A universal principle would emphasize that language should convey messages appropriately by saying things simply as possible and de-emphasizes deviating from the rules of writing. In contrast, a socio-cultural perspective can identify writing with a basis of invention where the point is no longer to communicate or to no longer necessarily make sense to one another but to be deviant, to break the rules and invent. Thus, getting outside the frame we are tracing involves a willingness to stop making sense; as O'Sullivan says, "it stops making sense; so it can do something else" (O'Sullivan, 2016, p. 213). From this lens, we may understand how a universal perspective on writing can eliminate the desire to engage in writing deviance. Yet, from a socio-cultural view of writing deviance is central to using narrative as a form of knowledge invention.

Practical Implications

Means of Communication

In chapter 3, this project demonstrated how varying historical and cultural philosophies resulted in different storytelling devices and values of writing (i.e. early versus contemporary criminology, positivist versus constructivist, quantitative versus qualitative). Despite that writing values can vary widely across sub-disciplinary sectors, they nonetheless send their work to similar journal outlets where a universal way of thinking about academic literacy is prominent. Thus, a central feature of tenure and promotion involves producing communication that is congruent with the literate expectations and universal conventions of the journal outlet. A failure to amend one's writing style can result in rejected work for literate reasons. Indeed, as we have seen in Chapter 5, writing values can set the standard from indicating the quality of one's research design, findings and insight: "Writing is critically important [to science]. I find that when I review a manuscript for a journal after one or two pages I usually have a pretty good sense of the general level of the paper. If it's poorly written that's a bad sign right off the bat" (Author 17).

This realization is not lost on critical criminologists and scholars from alternative schools. Bruce Arrigo (2009, para. 1) wrote:

> It is particularly difficult for critical scholars who often, through their research, challenge existing political, economic, and social structural dynamics, or otherwise resist prevailing sensibilities about law, crime, and justice. Part of our struggle is with dominant ideologies and how they are sustained through various means of communication. All too often I have, with my colleagues at the annual ASC, ACJS, and LSA meetings, exchanged war

> stories about academic publishing, assessed the psychology of revise and resubmit editorial decisions, and lamented the failure of members of the Division on Critical Criminology of the American Society of Criminology to assume, on a sustained basis, their rightful status among the legions of mainstream criminologists whose work routinely appears in high profile (read prestigious) periodicals.

For Arrigo (2009) ideology is sustained and reproduced through the "means of communication" conventional in the field. Thus, as Arrigo (2009) suggests, one's means of communication has epistemic values and represents worldview. In this sense, a universal perspective delimits the possible means of communication and undermines the socio-cultural power of creating new knowledge through writing invention.

However, the limitations of criminological knowledge have not only been under concern from the perspective of critical criminologists. Indeed, Wheeldon et al. (2014) recently demonstrated concerns over the efficacy of criminological science to understand crime is increasingly creeping onto a mainstream stage in the criminological community. Recent American Society of Criminology (ASC) presidential addresses have voiced distress over the ostensibly hermetic "limits of criminological knowledge" (Laub, 2004), "the complexity of evidence" (Clear, 2010), the field's "general historical illiteracy" (Bursik, 2009), and low levels of explained variance of contemporary criminological phenomenon (Weisburd & Piquero, 2008; Wikström, 2007). Wheeldon et al. (2014) suggest that criminology's legitimacy is found in continuing its inter-disciplinary legacy with discrete bodies of knowledge in order to expand our ability to understand criminological phenomena.

In the results, this study found that scholars would draw from a universal narrative when discussing writing more generally, but reverted to a socio-cultural lens when they

were prompted to illuminate literate definitions or writing values. However, the universal perspective does have material consequences when it comes to publishing in the field of criminology. For instance, style expectations that filter one's "means of communication" identifies the oppressive power of thinking of writing universally. That is, authors must align epistemic elements of their writing with that of the expectations of journals. From this vantage, it becomes a concern of whether it is possible to tread new ground and expand the limits of criminological knowledge under the auspices of the universal expectations of journal outlets, reviewers, and editors.

Thus, a practical implication for criminology comes from the notion of engaging in writing deviance. The concept of writing deviance was introduced in Chapter 7, where the best writers were described as being willing to wander beyond the rules and push the boundaries. Indeed, although scholars identified generally that good writers homogeneously follow the rules, they also suggested a socio-cultural contradiction. That is, the best writers are not afraid to transgress the rules incrementally. If we combine the notion of the universal, homogenous style with the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis introduced in the previous section, it seems that a universal style in criminology may limit the "means of communication," and in turn, produce hermetic "limits of criminological knowledge" (Laub, 2004).

Thus, it may be productive if we attempt to resist the homogenizing powers of the universal perspective in criminology. This can take place in a few manners, such as at the level of the scholar, the mentor, and the journal outlet. First, individual scholars can resist these delimiting effects by strategically engaging in writing deviance. That is, one may attempt to move beyond the rules so as to say something new from unexplored

epistemic grounds. However, as indicated in the findings, the individual must understand the rules in order to incrementally and procedurally move beyond the rules. Otherwise, complete resistance to the rules can be read as an open revolt against the community and become rejected. Nonetheless, in this study, transgressing the rules is posed—through data and theoretical model—as a positive action for the field.

Second, mentors can encourage and train generations of upcoming scholars to write creatively while also positioning themselves as part of the collective. Mentors can provide counsel to upcoming scholars on where the line of the rules lies, and simultaneously, cultivate the "third eye" of the individual. The third eye is a reference to Chapter 7, in which an author stressed the creative importance of unique individual experiences and philosophies as part of one's writing style. These background experiences sprout unique epistemic positions on the world that may be harnessed to extend the limits of criminological knowledge. Third, journal outlets can encourage alternative and innovative styles of writing as an intellectual exercise in order to transgress the limits of criminological knowledge. As a part of an outlet's scope, a journal may encourage authors to use alternative writing structures and inventive literacy strategies to facilitate new epistemic vantages by which to expand knowledge. If writing is epistemic, then encouraging new writing methods and patterns should create a transgression of lamented criminological limits—such as historical illiteracy, new explanations of deviance and alternative definitions of what counts as evidence

Scientific Discussion on Literate Practice in Criminology

When we consider research directions, the merging of writing studies with criminology has important implications for the field. Namely, writing studies provide a

language by which we may understand our own literate practices. From a socio-cultural framework, discourse communities independently negotiate practices and writing values among members. Although this study has identified that writing style can be disparate across small sub-set groups and sub-disciplinary sectors, there are also community-wide practices that are subject to field characteristics. Thus, from a socio-cultural framework, we can see that literate practices which facilitate the production of manuscripts and other texts are negotiated disparately from one discipline to the next.

If each field constructs and negotiates literate practices, we can begin to understand the unique terrain of literate practices and values in criminology. Additionally, it is also the case that unique literate constructions are based upon characteristics of the field. For instance, the characteristics of criminology are certainly different than biology (i.e. the number of scholars, number of incoming graduate students, etc.). Thus, we may explore how the characteristics of criminology limit or bolster the effectiveness of criminological convention and practice. This is important as it arms criminology with writing studies frameworks that provide an opportunity to understand and catch-up with other long-standing disciplines—such as hard sciences, bio-medical sciences and social science fields that have existed for centuries—in understanding the unique terrain of our own literate practices.

For example, Paternoster and Brame (2015) have recently implored the criminological community to begin to critically examine the entire publishing process. They urge that a productive starting point to critically investigate the efficacy of the publishing process is peer review. By using writing studies frameworks, we may arm ourselves to study community-wide practices such as the blind peer review model.

Although the field follows the traditional, universal model of blind peer review, characteristics of the criminological culture surely are different than other fields and have influence over the efficacy of the blind peer review system. Once we discern how the characteristics of the field influence these normal science practices, we may create a dialogue about amending them to overcome normal science crises. That is, for example, if we discern that criminology has too few reviewers for too many manuscripts we may identify ways to amend the process of review; such as, its process, its duration, the convention of who reviews, and so on.

Developing Writing Language in Criminology

Beyond providing analytical frameworks for a formal scientific investigation into criminological literate practices, writing studies also offer a rich, conceptual history filled with fruitful terminologies. These terminologies provide effective labels to dissect one's literate practice and the practices of others. Learning and understanding these terms could be helpful for criminologists. Primarily these terminologies could be helpful in training and for articulating writing instruction to the upcoming generation of scholars.

Writing studies have identified across various disciplines frustrations that emanate from the mentor/graduate student relationship in terms of writing training (Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Pare, 2011). Particularly, research has cataloged mentor frustration in teaching graduate students how to write, and in turn, graduate student frustration has been documented in mentor inability to articulate writing moves. Graduate students have charged mentors as having writing "automaticity," in which years of accumulated experience prohibit scholars from being able to put into words how

students can improve their writing. Likewise, mentors lament the failures of students to comprehend and absorb technical rules that seem all too simple.

Productively, writing studies have documented a plethora of language that can be useful in dissecting these moves that one makes on the pages of a manuscript. For instance, writing studies have identified concepts such as "structuring (IMRAD)," "paragraphing," and the "Uneven U" to conceptualize writing patterns and techniques found in manuscripts. These terminologies are useful to label writing moves and procedures that are common in writing across disciplines. They do not impose a type of writing, but rather allow the useful categorization of writing moves.

Employing these terminologies as typical researcher nomenclature when discussing writing practice can help ease frustrations between criminological mentors and graduate students (Aitchison & Lee, 2006; Kamler & Thomson, 2006; Pare, 2011). From the mentor perspective, a writing language can help mentors articulate the exact and specific issues that graduate students struggle with (i.e. paragraphing). From a student perspective, individuals can understand and articulate their own moves within a language that provides insight into the various ways moves are made across disciplines. A writing language also gives upcoming scholars the opportunity to understand writing moves within the larger criminological "writing game" (Casanave, 2002) from a strategic viewpoint. In other words, it allows to authors to imagine tactical writing moves that adhere to writing conventions but also allow them to be deviant and creative enough to slightly extend beyond the borders of rules. Once they understand the writing game and its moves, they can make logical decisions in drawing out identity and make choices that improve the chances to be successfully published.

Limitations

This study has sustained a couple conceptual limitations. First, the findings from this study demonstrate that style is a complicated matter, as interviews revealed a tension in which standardized writing practice collides with decentered personal histories and the inter-discursive nature of the presentation of social reality. For this reason, by definition, this project cannot be considered generalizable to the population. In fact, the parameters of the population to which this even applies are debatable. For one, the sampling frame is ineffective in indicating the population, as the co-constructed list of top criminologists represents the very tension between homogeneous and multiple styles—of what counts as successful and productive—investigated in this project. In fact, many criminologists publish in an array of different journals outside the field of criminology. On the other hand, the broader criminologist cannot be used as it becomes a question of how we are to draw hermetic borders around what constitutes a criminologist (e.g. based on doctoral degree, the most regularly published journals, the most visited conferences, self-identification, etc.). In part, this limitation lends credence to the theoretical basis of the project. If there is no core constitutive element that makes up a criminologist, then how could we not be constructing criminological "style" in the present?

Second, the sample may also come under fire for being both too large and too small. The irony of doing an interdisciplinary study about disciplinary differences in writing and scientific values is palpable in its research design characteristics, such as sampling. In criminology, the sample may come under fire for failing to investigate a large enough proportion of the sampling frame (although 40% seems high), or the population itself (whatever that may be). A central tenet of the socio-cultural legitimacy

found in criminology's science is located in sample size; meaning that the size of the sample is important to make useful predictions from sample to population. Generally, a larger sample size is important for legitimacy in criminology because the proportion of the sample to population provides more statistical power bolstering the predictive capacity of positive research. However, as this study demonstrates in the ambiguous nature of the constituent element of a criminologist, parameters that identify populations are generally often arbitrary constructions. In contrast, writing studies may take issue with a sample that is too large for its own good. If the goal is to acquire rich data using grounded methodology—where social theory sprouts from studied individuals—why should one ever choose to increase the sample number at risk of creating shallow data? From this vantage, it seems that longer interviews and the use of multiple qualitative analytical strategies within a small sample would elicit the highest quality social data. In this study, I attempt to appease both disciplinary communities at my own peril. While forty percent of the sampling frame and forty collected interviews is a considerable number, interviews were still generally in-depth and rich conversations.

Conclusion

This dissertation has brought a writing studies and literary theoretical framework to begin a conversation in the field considering literate practices and values. Thus, this study has contributed to the field by drawing a bridge between criminological practice and the rich empirical and theoretical scope of writing studies. This was accomplished through two primary ways. First, a writing studies and literary theoretical model was used as a point of departure to garner an understanding through scholar perceptions of literate

practices and values of good writing in the field. Second, findings were analyzed within a writing studies and literary theoretical model in order to demonstrate that although scholars often drew from a universal model, that in reality, their perceptions fall more in line with a socio-cultural perspective.

This study has used an interpretive lens to produce an appreciative narrative for the role that writing fulfills in the course of criminological research and of the most influential scholars in this sample. Although scientific writing instruction is often articulated with condemnatory undertones where "writing up" and "getting out of the way" are lauded, perceptions here demonstrate that writing is seen as creative, interpretive, and innovative. In fact, lionized scholars in the field are those that add a creative flair to writing. By packaging writing practices within a universal narrative, we risk constructing a neglectful imaginary in which we undermine the subjective interpretation inscribed into the words and content of research.

NOTES

1) It has been brought to my attention that a small, but growing contingent of literature addresses the support and training of graduate students in writing and speaking within their field. For more on this topic, see Caplan, Cox, and Phillips (2016).

2) Literary theory, writing studies and applied linguistics has sustained a rich history of analyzing academic writing. For example, writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the discipline (WID) research have investigated writing practices in disciplines and the use of writing tasks to catalyze writing learning (Bazerman et al. 2005; Russell, 2002; Russell et al., 2009; Zawacki & Rogers, 2012). In addition, there have been many self-reported accounts (see Casanave & Li, 2008; Casanave & Vandrick, 2003) and qualitative studies (see Casanave, 2002; 2005; Duff, 2010; Paltridge, Starfield & Tardy, 2016; Prior, 1998) by the faculty across disciplines on writing practices.

3) The writing studies framework used in this study is a makeshift framework for the purposes of introducing the discipline to a criminological audience. In reality, writing studies is a field that entertains a wide variety of epistemologies, perspectives and theoretical frameworks. For the purposes of the current study, a makeshift framework has been composed to represent basic and broad principles that are widely accepted in writing studies, and yet, which represent unexplored territory to a criminological audience.

REFERENCES

Abbott, C., & Eubanks, P. (2005). How academics and practitioners evaluate technical texts: A focus group study. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *19*(2), 171-218.

Aitchison, C., & Lee, A. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *11*(3), 265-278.

Altheide, D.L. and J.M. Johnson (1994) 'Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research', in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Antosofia. (2003). The dominion and the intellectuals: Noam Chomsky interviewed by an anonymous interviewer. Retrieved from https://chomsky.info/2003____/.

Apramian, T., Cristancho, S., Watling, C., & Lingard, L. (2017). (Re) Grounding grounded theory: a close reading of theory in four schools. *Qualitative research*, *17*(4), 359-376.

Arrigo, B. (2009). The perils of publishing and the call to action. *Critical Criminology: News, Opinion, Resources, Learning.* Retrieved from, http://critcrim.org/the-perils-of-publication-and-the-call-to-action.htm.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. *Austin: University of Texas Press, 198*.

Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*, 83-96.

Bazerman, C. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum*. Parlor Press LLC.

Becker, H. (1963*). Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York.

Becker, A. L. (1995). *Beyond translation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bern, D. (1987). Writing the empirical journal. *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist*, *171*.

Bizzell, P. (1992). What is a discourse community. *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*, 222-237.

Brent, J. J., & Kraska, P. B. (2010). Moving beyond our methodological default: A case for mixed methods. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *21*(4), 412-430.

Buckler, K. (2008). The quantitative/qualitative divide revisited: A study of published research, doctoral program curricula, and journal editor perceptions. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *19*(3), 383-403.

Bursik, Robert (2009). The Dead Sea Scrolls and Criminological Knowledge: 2008 Presidential Address to the American Society of Criminology. Criminology 47(1): 5-16.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble and the subversion of identity*. New York et Londres: Routledge.

Caplan, M. Cox, & T. Phillips (Eds.), Supporting graduate student writers: Research, Curriculum, and Program Design (pp. 22-51). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games*. Mahwah: LEA.

Casanave, C. P. (2005). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah: Routledge.

Casanave, C. P., & Vandrick, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah: Routledge.

Casanave, C. P., Li, X. (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ceci, S. J., & Peters, D. P. (1982). A Naturalistic Study of Peer Review in Psychology: The Fate of Published Articles, Resubmitted. *Behavior and Brain Sciences*, 5, 187-252.

Ceci, S. J., & Peters, D. (1984). How blind is blind review? *American Psychologist*, *39*(12), 1491-1494.

Charmaz K (2011). Grounded theory methods in social justice research. In: Denzin N and Lincoln Y (eds). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative research* (fourth edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 359–380.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.

Clarke, A. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Sage.

Clark, I. (2007). *Writing the successful thesis and dissertation: Entering the conversation*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall Press.

Cohen, S. (1988). *Against criminology*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Changes in scholarly influence in major American criminology and criminal justice journals between 1986 and 2000. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *18*(1), 6-34.

Cohn, E. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Scholarly influence and prestige in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *22*(1), 5-11.

Copes, H., Tewksbury, R., & Sandberg, S. (2016). Publishing qualitative research in criminology and criminal justice journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *27*(1), 121-139.

Cox, B. G., & Roland, C. G. (1973). How rhetoric confuses scientific issues. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, (3), 140-142.

Cullen, F. T. (2011). Beyond adolescence-limited criminology: Choosing our future—the American Society of Criminology 2010 Sutherland. *Criminology*, *49*(2), 287-330.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations: 1972–1990*, trans. Joughin M. New York: Columbia University Press.

Denney, A. S., & Tewksbury, R. (2013). How to write a literature review. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *24*(2), 218-234.

Denzin, N. (1994). *Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research*. Eds: Norman K. Denzin, N. &. Lincoln, Y, Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*, trans. G. Spivak. *Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University*.

DiCristina, B. (1997). The quantitative emphasis in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *8*(2), 181-199.

DiCristina, B. (2000). Prediction, policy, and quantitative inquiry: A reply to Worrall. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 11(2), 363-369.*

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 169-192.

Emirbayer, M. & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology* 103(4): 962–1023.

Eubanks, P. (2010). *Metaphor and writing: Figurative thought in the discourse of written communication*. Cambridge University Press Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fish, S. E. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?: The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press.

Fisher, B. S., Vander Ven, T. M., Cobane, C. T., Cullen, F. T., & Williams, N. (1998). Trends in multiple-authored articles in criminology and criminal justice: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *9*(1), 19-38.

Fletcher, R. J. (2011). *Mentor author, mentor texts: Short texts, craft notes, and practical classroom uses*. Heinemann.

Fleetwood, J. (2016). Narrative habitus: Thinking through structure/agency in the narratives of offenders. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 1741659016653643.

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(1), 1-16.

Foucault, M. (1995). 1977. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (2012). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Vintage.

Gardner, M.J. & Bond, J. (1990). An exploratory study of statistical assessment of papers published in the British Medical Journals. *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 263, 1355-1357.

Garland, D. (1985). The criminal and his science: A critical account of the formation of criminology at the end of the nineteenth century. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *25*(2), 109-137.

Garland, D. (1992). Criminological knowledge and its relation to power: Foucault's genealogy and criminology today. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *32*(4), 403-422.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Sociology Pr.

Glueck, S, & Glueek, E. T. (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, S. N., Berlin, J., Fletcher, S. W., & Fletcher, R. H. (1994). Manuscript quality before and after peer review and editing at Annals of Internal Medicine. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 121, 11–21.

Hahn Fox, B., & Jennings, W. G. (2014). How to write a methodology and results section for empirical research. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *25*(2), 137-156.

Halfpenny, P. (2014). *Positivism and Sociology (RLE Social Theory): Explaining Social Life*. New York: Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1977). *Explorations in the functions of language.* New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Haraway, D. (1988) Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, *Feminist Studies* 14, 575–599.

Harris, J. (1989). The idea of community in the study of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 40, 11-37.

Harwood, N. (2005). 'Nowhere has anyone attempted… In this article I aim to do just that': A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *37*(8), 1207-1231.

Hedgecock (2008) *Lessons I must have missed: Implicit literate practices in graduate education.* (Eds.*)* Casanave, C. P., Li, X. (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Herron, D. M. (2012). Is expert peer review obsolete? A model suggests that post-publication reader review may exceed the accuracy of traditional peer review. *Surgical endoscopy*, 26(8), 2275-2280.

Higgins, G. E. (2009). Quantitative versus Qualitative Methods: Understanding Why Quantitative Methods are Predominant in Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, 1(1), 23-37.

Hooton, E. A. (1939). *Crime and the Man*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University.

Horrobin, D. F. (1990). The philosophical basis of peer review and the suppression of innovation. *Jama*, *263*(10), 1438-1441.

Horrobin, D. F. (1996). Peer review of grant applications: A harbinger for mediocrity in clinical research? *The Lancet*, 348(9037), 1293.

Hyland, K. (1999). Disciplinary discourses: Writer stance in research articles. In Candlin, C. N., & Hyland, K. (Ed.). *Writing: Texts, processes and practices.* New York: Routledge., 99-121.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Irwin, W. (2004). Against intertextuality. *Philosophy and literature*, *28*(2), 227-242.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing* (Vol. 5). John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/swll.5.

Jacques, S. (2014). The quantitative–qualitative divide in criminology: A theory of ideas' importance, attractiveness, and publication. *Theoretical Criminology*, *18*(3), 317-334.

Jameson, F. (1961). *Sartre: The Origins of a Style*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jefferson, R., Alderson, P., Wager, E., Davidoff, F. (2002). Effects of editorial peer review: A systematic review. *Jama,* 287(21), 2784–2786.

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2006, April). Doctoral writing: Pedagogies for work with literatures. In *AERA annual meeting, April 2006, San Fransisco* (pp. 5-7).

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision*. New York: Routledge.

Kraska, P., & Neuman, W. L. (2012). *Criminal justice and criminology research methods*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kronick, D. A. (1990). Peer review in 18th-century scientific journalism. *Jama*, *263*(10), 1321-1322.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh* (Vol. 4). New york: Basic books.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.

Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Schwartz, A. (1991). Master metaphor list: 2nd draft copy.

Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual review of sociology*, *28*(1), 167-195.

Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lamott, A. (1995). *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and L*ife. NY: Anchor Books.

Lanham, R. A. (2006). *The economics of attention: Style and substance in the age of information*. University of Chicago Press.

Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (1991). The Sutherland-Glueck debate: On the sociology of criminological knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1402-1440.

Laub, John (2004). The Life Course of Criminology in the United States: The American Society of Criminology Presidential Address, 2003. Criminology 42 (1): 1-25.

Laub, J. H. (2006). Edwin H. Sutherland and the Michael-Adler Report: Searching for the soul of criminology seventy years later. *Criminology*, *44*(2), 235-258.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Leitch, V. B. (1983). *Deconstructive criticism, An advanced introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written communication*, *23*(1), 3-35.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2015). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic inquiry*, *289*, 331.

Lindsey, D. (1988). Assessing precision in the manuscript review process: A little better than a dice roll. *Scientometrics*, *14*(1-2), 75-82.

Lindsey, D. (1991). Precision in the manuscript review process: Hargens and Herting revisited. *Scientometrics*, *22*(2), 313-325.

Lock, S. (1988). Fraud in medicine. British Medical Journal, 296, 376–377.

Locke, S. (1985). A difficult balance: Editorial peer review in medicine. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust.

Lombroso, C., Gibson, M., & Rafter, N. H. (2006). *Criminal man*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Maddox, J. (1992). Conflicts of interest declared. Nature, 360, 205.

Mandelbaum, D. G. (1963). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA

Matsuda, P. K., and Tardy, C. M. (2007). Voice in Academic Writing: The Rhetorical Construction of Author Identity in Blind Manuscript Review. *English for Specific Purposes* 26(2), p. 235–49.

Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, *37*(3), 413-431.

Matza, D. (1967). *Delinquency and drift*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Matza, D. (1982). *Becoming deviant*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Miller, C. R. (1979). A humanistic rationale for technical writing. *College English*, *40*(6), 610-617.

Mills, C. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mohamed, A. R., & Erik D. Fritsvold. (2010). *Dorm Room Dealers*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2008). Reviewers' views on reviewing: An examination of the peer review process in criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *19*(3), 351-365.

Olinger, A. R. (2014). On the instability of disciplinary style: Common and conflicting metaphors and practices in text, talk, and gesture. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *48*(4), 453.

Olinger, A. R. (2016). A Sociocultural approach to style. *Rhetoric Review*,*35*(2), 121-134.

Orrick, E. A., & Weir, H. (2011). The most prolific sole and lead authors in elite criminology and criminal justice journals, 2000–2009. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *22*(1), 24-42.

O'Sullivan, S. (2016). Deleuze Against Control: Fictioning to Myth-Science. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *33*(7-8), 205-220.

Paltridge, B., Starfield, S., & Tardy, C. M. (2016). *Ethnographic perspectives on academic writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paré, A. (2011). Speaking of writing: Supervisory feedback and the dissertation. In *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators* (pp. 59-74). Springer Netherlands.

Porter, J. E. (1986). Intertextuality and the discourse community. *Rhetoric Review*, *5*(1), 34-47.

Pratt, T. C. (2014). How to be a successful publisher. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *30*(4), 378-391.

Prior, P. (2003, March). Are communities of practice really an alternative to discourse communities. *In meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics*, Arlington, VA.

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity*. Mahweh, NY Lawrence Erlbaum.

Radzinowicz, L. (1988). *The Cambridge Institute of Criminology: Its background and scope: a report*. HMSO.

Rafter, N. (2005a). The murderous Dutch fiddler: Criminology, history and the problem of phrenology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(1), 65-96.

Rafter, N. (2005b). Cesare Lombroso and the origins of criminology: Rethinking criminological tradition. In Lanier, M. M., & Henry, S. (Ed.). *Essential criminology (*p.33-42). Westview Press.

Rafter, N., & Ystehede, P. (2010). Here be dragons: Lombroso, the gothic, and social control. *Popular culture crime and social control*, *14*, 263-284.

Reddy, M. (1979). The conduit metaphor. *Metaphor and thought*, *2*, 285-324.

Reynolds, N., Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (2004). *The Bedford bibliography for teachers of writing*. Bedford/St. Martin's.

Rorty, R. (1978). Philosophy as a kind of writing: An essay on Derrida. *New Literary History*, *10*(1), 141-160.

Rowland, F. (2002). The peer-review process. *Learned publishing*, *15*(4), 247-258.

Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: SIU Press.

Russell, D. R., Lea, M., Parker, J., Street, B., & Donahue, T. (2009). *Exploring notions of genre in 'academic literacies' and 'writing across the curriculum': Approaches across countries and contexts.* WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press.

Schaefer, K. L. (2015). "Emphasizing Similarity" but Not "Eliding Difference": Exploring Sub-Disciplinary Differences as a Way to Teach Genre Flexibly. *The WAC Journal*, *26*, 36.

Schreck, C. J. (2006). The editor's farewell. *Journal of Crime and Justice,* 29, iv-v.

Sever, B. (2001). Research methods for criminal justice graduate students: Comparing textbook coverage and classroom instruction. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *12*(2), 337-353.

Sollaci, L. B., & Pereira, M. G. (2004). The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure: a fifty-year survey. Journal of the medical library association, 92(3), 364.

Starke-Meyerring, D. (2011). The paradox of writing in doctoral education: Student experiences. In *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators* (pp. 75-95). Springer Netherlands.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. Sage.

Swales, J. M. (2016). Reflections on the concept of discourse community. *ASp. la revue du GERAS*, (69), 7-19.

Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Tewksbury, R., DeMichele, M. T., & Miller, J. M. (2005). Methodological orientations of articles appearing in criminal justice's top journals: Who publishes what and where. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *16*(2), 265-279.

Tewksbury, R. (2009). Qualitative versus quantitative methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, *1*(1), 38-58.

Tewksbury, R., Dabney, D. A., & Copes, H. (2010). The prominence of qualitative research in criminology and criminal justice scholarship. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *21*(4), 391-411.

Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2011). How many authors does it take to write an article? An assessment of criminology and criminal justice research article author composition. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *22*(1), 12-23.

Thaiss, C., & Zawacki, T. M. (2006). *Engaged writers dynamic disciplines*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Thomson, P., & Kamler, B. (2016). *Detox Your Writing: Strategies for Doctoral Researchers*. London and New York: Routledge.

Threadgold, T. (1997). Critical literacies and the teaching of English. *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice*, 353-385.

Torrance, M.S. & Thomas, G.V. (1994) The development of writing skills in doctoral research students, in: R. G. Burgess (Ed.) Postgraduate education and training in the social sciences (London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers).

Van Way III, C. W. (2007). Writing a scientific paper. *Nutrition in Clinical Practice*, *22*(6), 636-640.

Voloshinov, M. (1973). The Philosophy of Language. In *Trans. L. Matejka and IR Titunik. New York: Seminar*.

Walters, G. D. (2015). Measuring the quantity and quality of scholarly productivity in criminology and criminal justice: A test of three integrated models. *Scientometrics*, 102(3), 2011-2022.

Weisburd, David & Piquero, Alex (2008) How Well Do Criminologists Explain Crime? Statistical Modeling in Published Studies. Crime and Justice, 37: 453-502.

Wenneras, C. & Wold, A. (1997), Nepotism and sexism in peer-review, *Nature*, 387 (6631): 341–343.

Wheeldon, J., Heidt, J., & Dooley, B. (2014). The trouble (s) with unification: debating assumptions, methods, and expertise in criminology. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, *6*(2), 111.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). Philosophical Investigations. Translated [from the German] by GEM Anscombe.

Worrall, J. L. (2000). In defense of the "quantoids": More on the reasons for the quantitative emphasis in criminal justice education and research. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(2), 353-361.

Young, J. (2011). *The criminological imagination*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Zanna, M. P., & Darley, J. M. (Eds.). (1987). *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist*. Psychology Press.

Zawacki, T. M., & Rogers, P. M. (2012). *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook*. Centers for Teaching and Technology - Book Library.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ethan Maxwell Higgins

2301 S. 3rd St., Brigman Hall, Louisville, KY 40292
ethan.higgins@louisville.edu

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

2017-Present, Research Assistant
Department of Criminal Justice, University of Louisville

2014-Present, Graduate Assistant
Department of Criminal Justice, University of Louisville

2011-2013, Graduate Assistant
Department of Criminal Justice, Eastern Kentucky University

EDUCATION

Ph.D. 2018 Criminal Justice, University of Louisville
Dissertation: The Styles of Criminology: Writing Among the Stars
Chair: Kristin M. Swartz
M.A. 2013 Criminal Justice, Eastern Kentucky University
B.S. 2010 Criminal Justice, Eastern Kentucky University

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Criminological Theory
Theoretical Integration/Advancement
Qualitative Methods
Criminal Justice Personnel
School Violence and Response
Criminal Justice Research Practices

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles
(Date accepted; * denotes graduate student author)

2017 **Higgins, E. M**. The state of peer review in criminology: Literary theory, perceptions, and the Catch-22 metaphor of peer review. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, DOI: 10.1080/10511253.2017.1420809. 2017 **Higgins, E. M**. & Swartz, K. The Knowing of monstrosities: Necropower, spectacular punishment, and denial. *Critical Criminology,* 1-16, DOI: 10.1007/s10612-017-9382-7.

2017 **Higgins, E. M**., & Swartz, K. Edgeways as a theoretical extension: Connecting crime pattern theory and New Urbanism. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 1-15, DOI: 10.1057/s41300-017-0021-8.

2016 **Higgins, E. M**., & *Rolfe, S. 'The Sleeping Army': Necropolitics and the collateral consequences of being a sex offender. *Deviant Behavior,* 38(9), 975-990.

2016 **Higgins, E. M**, & Swartz, K. The descent of nature: "Othering" in historical newspapers. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 8(2), 90-104.

Under Review
(Submission date)

10/17 Fisher, B. W., **Higgins, E. M**., & *Homer, E. School crime and the implementation of security cameras: Findings from a national longitudinal study. *Justice Quarterly* (Revise and Resubmit on 12/14/2017).

02/18 **Higgins, E. M**. & Fisher, B. W., & Nation, M. Seeing and responding: How school authority figures fail to respond to bullying. *Journal of School Violence.*

In Progress
(Planned submission date)

5/18 **Higgins, E.M.**, Fisher, B.W., & Swartz, K. Saving snitching: Producing informants, breaking codes of silence and the use of the savior narrative among SROs.

6/18 Swartz, K., **Higgins, E. M**. & *French, A. The prevalence of PTSD among correctional officers.

07/18 **Higgins, E. M**., Fisher, B.W., & *Homer, E. Student perceptions of a safe school space: A systematic review of qualitative literature.

07/18 **Higgins, E. M**. The state of authorship in criminology: Key elements according to the "Stars" in Criminology.

08/18 Campbell, B. A., & **Higgins, E. M**. Socialization and job preparedness among reserve police officers: Evidence from participant observation and in-depth interviews

08/18 Fisher, B. W., Dawson-Edwards, C., **Higgins, E. M**., & Swartz, K. Examining the link between racial disparities in school climate and school discipline

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Research Assistant

NIJ Grant, University of Louisville
7/2017 to present
Project Title: *School Climate, Student Discipline, and the Implementation of School Resource Officers* (Amount funded: $370,307)
Supervisor: Dr. Benjamin W. Fisher

- Participated in composing a semi-structured interview protocol to investigate School Resource Police Officers roles and responsibilities.
- Lead analyst in coding and extracting themes from qualitative dataset of interviews with SRO's.
- Brought on the project to lead composition of qualitative papers.

Graduate Assistant
University of Louisville
8/2016 to 6/2017
Supervisor: Dr. Benjamin W. Fisher

- Participated in data collection and analysis for meta-analysis and systematic review on projects investigating school discipline and perceived safety in schools.
- Leading the composition of one paper that is currently under review and leading a second that is in progress.
- Participated and contributed to multiple papers in progress involving school climate, suspension and crime or disorder in school settings.

Research Assistant
Kentucky's Department of Corrections Grant, University of Louisville
1/2016 to present
Project Title: *Examining the Prevalence and Correlates of PTSD and Quality of Life Issues among Kentucky Department of Corrections Staff* (Amount funded: $91,000)
Supervisor: Dr. Kristin Swartz

- Brought on the project to aid in qualitative data collection and analysis of trauma in correctional officers through focus groups.
- Constructed the semi-structured interview guide for the focus groups.
- Brought on the project to lead qualitative analysis and composition of qualitative papers.

Graduate Assistant
Graduate Assistantship, University of Louisville
8/2014-7/2016
Supervisor: Dr. Kristin Swartz

- Led the qualitative research design, data collection and analysis of an archival dataset.
- Led the composition of two papers, both of which have been published.

PRESENTATIONS

2017 Fisher, B, W., Swartz, K., Dawson-Edwards, C., Fritz, K., & Higgins, E. M. Examining the link between racial disparities in school climate and school discipline. Presented at American Society of Criminology Conference: Philadelphia, PA.

2016 Higgins, E. M., & Rolfe, S. 'The Sleeping Army': Necropolitics and the collateral consequences of being a sex offender. Presented at Southern Criminal Justice Association Conference: Savannah, GA.

2015 Higgins, E. M., & Swartz, K. The descent of nature. Presented at the American Society of Criminology Conference: Washington, DC.

2015 Higgins, E. M., Rausch, C., Nelson, N., & Nicholson, J. Criminal mediation in Louisville, Kentucky. Presented at Southern Criminal Justice Association Conference: Charleston, SC.

2012 Wheaton, A., Moran, R., Felden, J., Tate, C., Karpova, P., Higgins, E. M., & Wells, J. B. "Peeragogy" in Action: Utilizing Applied Research in the Classroom. Presented at the 2012 annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology: Chicago, IL.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Juvenile Justice, CJ 360
Fall 2015 (65 Students)
Research Methods, CJ 325
Fall 2015 (27 Students)
Life in Prisons, COR 302 (online facilitator—4 sections)
Violence in America, CJ 426 (online facilitator—1 section)
Critical Issues in Criminal Justice, COR 423 (online facilitator—2 sections)
Criminal Justice Ethics, CRJ 313 (online facilitator—1 section)
Exploring the Death Penalty, COR 412 (online facilitator—1 section)

TEACHING INTERESTS

Research Methods
Qualitative Methods
Crime Prevention/Opportunity Theory
Criminological Theory
Introduction to Policing
Juvenile Justice

SERVICE

Peer Reviewer:
Journal of Criminal Justice Education; Criminal Justice Studies