WEEK 9

Strengthening Your Structure

Task Day	Week 9 Daily Writing Tasks	Estimated Task Time in Minutes	
		HumInt	SciQua
Day 1 (Monday?)	Read from here until you reach the week 9, day 2 tasks, filling in any boxes, checking off any forms, and answering any questions as you read.	90	90
Day 2 (Tuesday?)	Outline a good published article.	60	30
Day 3 (Wednesday?)	Make a postdraft outline of your article.	90	60
Day 4 (Thursday?)	Restructure your article.	120+	90+
Day 5 (Friday?)	Restructure your article.	120+	90+
Total estimated time for reading the workbook, completing the tasks, and writing your article		**8+ hours**	**6+ hours**

Above are the tasks for your eighth week. Start this week by scheduling when you will write, and then tracking the time you actually spend writing (using the Calendar for Actual Time Spent Writing This Week form or online software).

Some articles need a lot of restructuring; others need only a little. If you find yourself making dramatic changes this week—moving paragraphs, cutting cases, tossing or adding whole sections—that's a good sign. It means you're gaining clarity about your article and getting closer to submitting it to a journal. If, after thinking carefully about the logical flow of your article, you make few to no changes, that's good too. You're making your last checks.

WEEK 9, DAY 1: READING AND TASKS

EIGHTH WEEK IN REVIEW

You have now spent eight weeks on vital article publishing tasks: designing a plan, selecting a text for revision, writing an abstract, organizing your article around your argument, picking the right journal, reviewing the scholarship, crafting your claims for significance, and presenting and analyzing your evidence. Congratulations! If you made it this far in the workbook, feel free to tweet me using the hashtag #WYJA8W (*Writing Your Journal Article* 8 Weeks in) so that I can congratulate you.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF STRUCTURE

Journal articles are a specialized form of writing governed by highly standardized conventions. While these conventions vary a bit by discipline and field, they are for the most part surprisingly uniform.

One of the most standardized conventions is structure—that is, the organization of your argument and the evidence for your argument. A well-structured article is one in which ideas are organized hierarchically, based on their importance, and their organization is apparent. Without a strong structure, your article lacks a skeleton and its ideas collapse into a morass. With the skeleton of a strong structure, your article comes to life, supporting the weight of its own ideas. That's because regular patterns aid readability. Research indicates that people read a well-structured article more quickly and retain more of it (B. Meyer 2003, 208, 212, 214). Strong structure also enables readers to grasp content more readily, converting them from distracted observers to intrigued fellow travelers. Perhaps even more important, regular patterns aid *you*, the author. Organizing your ideas helps you better understand them and their connections to each other.

Arriving at a strong structure isn't easy, however. Frequently, we write down ideas in the order they come to us, perhaps rearranging them a bit in ways that are intuitive to us but not to others. Also, most of us write on computers, where we can see only a few paragraphs at a time; this makes it easy for us to lose the thread of the entire article. Finally, uncovering the best order for our articles "often cannot be done until the work is well underway" (Willis 1993, 156). So learning how to structure your article is essential if you want it to survive the peer-review process. This chapter offers techniques to help you understand the structure of your article and properly link its parts.

ARTICLE-STRUCTURING PRINCIPLES

The structure of articles can be categorized in a variety of ways. Studying some of these approaches may aid you in identifying the best structure for your article. In what follows, you'll find information about an article's macrostructure and microstructure, the five organizational structures of writing, and the best ways to structure information rhetorically and to signal structure to the reader. You'll also find information about how your familiarity with structures for other genres of writing may be interfering with your ability to structure your journal article as a journal article.

Macrostructure and Microstructure

You need to attend to two levels of your article's structure: macrostructure and microstructure. The macrostructure can be articulated in the outline of the article; the microstructure can be articulated in diagrams of the article's paragraphs and sentences. Some scholars alternately describe these as "coherence" and "cohesion," with coherence representing the overall organization of the article and cohesion representing "how smaller units of texts fit together, such as neighboring sentences" (McTigue and Slough 2010, 221; see also B. Meyer 1975; Halliday and Hasan 1976). During week 10, you'll be completing exercises to ensure that your microstructure is strong; this week is focused entirely on macrostructure.

In other words, then, macrostructure is the superstructure, the overarching meaning working down through the entire article to organize it, with argument being the main organizing principle. You have a coherent macrostructure when each section, subsection, and paragraph of your article is organized argumentatively into an overall logical structure—with everything in the right place, nothing missing, and nothing extraneous. The best description of journal article macrostructure is also one of the shortest, written by an anonymous senior scholar in a writing forum on July 26, 2012, at the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. "Marigolds" stated that an article does not have an "inductive shape." That is, he or she writes, it does not take the form of "*A*, thus *B*, then *C*, therefore *D*." Rather, it has an argumentative shape, which Marigolds described as "*D*! And the reasons for *D* are *A*, *B*, and *C*. And here's why you should care about *D*." This scholar gets it exactly right.

By contrast, microstructure is the focused meaning working *up* from the paragraph and sentence level, with clarity as the organizing principle. You have a cohesive microstructure when each sentence is clear and grammatical, leads logically to the next sentence, and adds up to a paragraph that has a unifying concept and hangs together. Too often, paragraphs consist of sentences that seem related, but lack logical, argumentative connections with each other.

As you may have guessed, distinguishing microstructure from macrostructure isn't always possible. The main aim of describing these two levels, however, is to aid you in avoiding a common problem. A frequent error of novice authors is spending all their time on the microstructural task of word phrasing and ignoring the macrostructural task of arranging. The heuristic of microstructure and macrostructure is just another way of saying, don't always stay down in the grass, in the details of the work, but get up into the trees, viewing the whole. This week, you'll be working on exercises to ensure that you're viewing your article as a whole and building a strong macrostructure.

Structural Building Blocks

Scholars maintain that there are five basic organizational structures in texts (B. Meyer, Brandt, and Bluth 1980; B. Meyer, Young, and Bartlett 1989). When teachers train students to recognize these basic structures, their reading and retention improve. By the same token, these strategies can aid us scholars not only to read better but to write more clearly and understand our own structures better. Journal articles use these structures at both the macrostructural and the microstructural level.

Description. The description structure is organized by information about a topic in which characteristics are described. This structure is commonly found in journal articles' introductory and/or background sections as well as in Methods sections; it is organized around the who, what, where, and when of the topic. A macrostructural example of the description structure would be an essay about gender-based violence that describes what it is, who it affects, and when and where it most often happens. All journal articles contain descriptive (also called expository) paragraphs, but an article that has only descriptive paragraphs and a description macrostructure can't be published in a peer-reviewed journal; it's not argumentative. Signals that description structure is in use include words and phrases such as *for example, such as, that is,* or *some features are*.

Sequence. The sequence structure is organized by sequential order, most often chronological or procedural, such that readers learn about events in order of their occurrence or learn how to make something. This structure is commonly found in journal articles' background, Methods, or Results sections. A macrostructural example of the sequence structure would be an article about gender-based violence that provides a history of scholarship on the problem or gives step-by-step instructions for training nurses to both recognize the signs of and report on such violence. An article that has only sequence (also called narrative) paragraphs and a sequence macrostructure can't be published; it's not argumentative. Signals that sequence structure is in use include words and phrases like *first, second, next, before,* or *more recently*.

Causation. The causation structure is organized by cause-and-effect relationships: why (cause) and what (effect) happened? This structure is commonly found in Results or Discussion sections of journal articles. A macrostructural example of the causation structure would be an article about gender-based violence that discusses theories of why men commit violence against women and the consequences of this violence for both. Causation structure is common in published journal articles. Signals that causation structure is in use include words and phrases such as *because, thus, as a result,* and *therefore*.

Problem-solution. The problem-solution structure is organized by a problem and its solution: it asks a question and answers it, defining the problem, unpacking its implications, thinking through it, and then addressing what is being done or what could be done to solve the problem. This structure is commonly found in Discussion sections of journal articles. A macrostructural example of the problem-solution structure would be an article about the problem of gender-based violence that lays out the efficacy of three attempted solutions. By contrast, an article about the problems that arose from certain solutions to gender-based violence, without proposing other solutions, would exhibit the causation structure. Problem-solution structure is common in published journal articles. Signals that a problem-solution structure is in use are words or phrases like *the question is, the puzzle facing, proposes,* or *responds*.

Comparison. The comparison structure is organized by the differences and similarities among things: in what ways are things alike; in what ways are they different? This structure commonly appears in literature reviews. A macrostructural example of the

comparison structure would be an article that discusses how gender-based violence among those in opposite-sex relationships differs from that in same-sex relationships. Comparison structure is common in published journal articles. Signals that a comparison structure is in use are words or phrases like *in contrast, instead, on the other hand, both*, or *similar.*

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Does my article contain more than descriptive or sequence macrostructure? If not, what can I do to improve that?

The Rhetorical Orders of Structure

Scholars also maintain that whatever structural building blocks a writer uses, readers understand information more easily when it appears in particular orders. What those sequences are can be mysterious to novice authors, however. Some of the excellent advice they learned in high school or college for structuring essays, such as the BEAM method (Background, Evidence, Analysis, Method) (Bizup 2008) and the MEAL plan (Main idea, Evidence, Analysis, Lead out) (Duke University 2012), may not seem perfectly apt for writing journal articles. So I want to focus on just two ordering methods: reader-knowledge-oriented order and Eric Hayot's "Uneven U" order.

Reader-Knowledge-Oriented Order

One principle that scholars recommend when structuring information in an article is to start where your readers are and bring them along. To orient your article toward readers, start with

- **The familiar.** Begin with what you assume your readers know and proceed to what they don't know.
- **The easy.** Proceed from the simple to the complex. Get your readers comfortable before introducing the difficult information.
- **The accepted.** Proceed from the uncontested to the more contested. Readers who have been convinced to believe one thing may more readily believe the next.
- **The overview.** Proceed from the general to the specific. Start with the big picture and then focus in on the details.
- **The few.** Proceed from discussing the fewest items to discussing the most. In other words, if you're analyzing a number of texts, objects, or studies, you might treat just a few in the first section of the article, more in the second section, and the most in the last section. This technique has argumentative weight, as you're laying out the argument with just a few pieces of evidence, but later piling up lots of evidence.
- **The historical.** Proceed chronologically from the past to the present. (This common sequence isn't always the best one; it tends toward a data-organized article rather than an argument-organized one.)
- **The visual.** Proceed spatially through a succession of linked objects, as if on a guided tour. This technique works particularly well for articles addressing a topic in art history and geography, for instance.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from using more of one of these orders? Where?

Hayot's "Uneven U" Order

Although designed for the humanities, any scholarly writers interested in improving their writing can benefit from Eric Hayot's useful theory of the "Uneven U," described in his book *The Elements of Academic Style* (2014). In chapter 8 of that text, Hayot breaks all writing down into five levels, from the most abstract to plain data, and advises how to organize them for rhetorical effect. The Uneven U is his theory of how academic prose moves—starting with abstract ideas, moving down into the details, and then traveling back up into the abstract. It does this within paragraphs, but also in the article overall. For example, one type of Uneven U paragraph "starts with a general statement of the problem, introduces evidence, provides evidence more fully, summarizes and interprets that evidence, and finally connects to a new idea whose endpoint lies beyond the paragraph itself" (Hayot 2014, 63).

You may have started to sense the Uneven U structure in previous weeks when you highlighted the presentation of evidence with green and its interpretation in blue, and saw that the beginnings of strong paragraphs tended to be blue. I have given only the bare bones of Hayot's sophisticated theory here; to take full advantage, you must read his chapter 8. Among the gems in this chapter is his point that scholarly paragraphs rarely have topic sentences of the high school type (which "tell the reader exactly what will happen in the paragraph") but rather have *opening* sentences (which make "thematic, argumentative, and structural promises") (Hayot 2014, 62). As he notes, authors shouldn't use his theory to draft all paragraphs, but knowing its principles can help you strengthen your prose. Study the beginnings and endings of your paragraphs—if they're not regularly more abstract than the middles of your paragraphs, you might need to make some changes. The same advice goes for the article as a whole.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from attending more to Hayot's Uneven U structure? Where?

Structure Signals

Moreover, scholars point out that whatever building blocks and rhetorical order writers use, readers understand information more easily when the text clearly signals the structure being used, rather than assuming that readers will intuitively grasp it. Fortunately, such signals aid not just your readers but also you the author, keeping you alert to logical sequence. Some stylebooks advise against obvious "signposting" (or, in a memorable phrase, "outside plumbing"). So do some scholars. As one senior scholar complained to me, authors should help readers to "smell the steak" and therefore should not "yell the steak." Nonetheless, I still recommend that you include structure signals to get your article through peer review. Then, if you're dedicated to a more literary style and really hate

such signaling, delete it in the copyediting phase of your writing process. At the peer-review stage, the benefits of signaling your structure outweigh any inelegance.

Subheadings. Research shows that people read material containing subheadings more quickly and understand more of it (B. Meyer 2003; Moore 2006; McCabe et al. 2006). Visible cues to structure are particularly helpful in getting reviewers to look on your article favorably. Even if you failed to do what you set out to do, your subheadings make your general project come across more clearly, and the peer reviewers can push you to accomplish what you intended for your article rather than rejecting your article outright. Subheadings help not just the reader but also you the author. One study showed that teaching college students to use descriptive headings in their writing resulted in a "marked improvement" in their article's organization, use of sources, and argument (Murphy 1998, 233). If you're writing a SciQua article, subheadings are uniform and required, but you may still find that additional subheadings aid your readers. For instance, some authors provide subheadings in their Methods section (e.g., Participants, Data Collection, Measures, and Analysis).

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from more subheadings? Where?

Synopsis. In HumInt articles, authors are wise to provide a summary at the end of the introduction about the order of information in the rest of their article. This overview serves as a road map, aiding readers in choosing to keep reading the article, as they have a clear view of what's ahead, which sections they need to read, and which they can skim. Even in fields where synopses haven't been common, such as literary studies, they are becoming commonplace. Just remember to keep yours brief—two to three sentences are generally sufficient.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Does my article have a synopsis? If not, might it benefit from one?

Summing-up sentences. Peter Elbow advises writers to make "lots of summings up" (Elbow 1998, 35). Providing a summing-up sentence or two at the end of sections or even some paragraphs aids the reader in seeing how the analyzed evidence has shaped the argument to that point in the article. The strongest articles move forward and sum up at the same time, regularly reminding readers of what's at stake and what they've learned so far. When exchanging articles, you may have found that the most frequent request of a reader was for more summation—whether of your argument up to that point, of the interpretation of that paragraph, of the answer to the main question so far, or of the articulation of conceptual connections. Just note that good summing up isn't verbatim restatement but argumentative nuancing or forceful clarity. For example, in an article

about representations of Native Americans, the author powerfully summed up her previous five pages discussing US history textbooks by three different authors, using just one sentence: "In Miller, Indians had been simply beneath notice; in Vaughn, they belonged to an inferior culture; and in Jennings, they were the more or less innocent prey of power-hungry whites" (Tompkins 1986, 107–8). Previews, indicating at the beginning of a section the argumentative destination of that section, can also be effective.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from more summing up? Where?

Switch-signaling words. Words that signal rhetorical switches are useful; examples include *nevertheless*, *however*, *by contrast*, and *on the one hand*. So are words that differentiate items in a sequence: *first*, *second*, *then*, *before*, and *after*. But don't use them except where they actually apply. Sometimes novice authors just sprinkle them at the beginning of sentences, which doesn't work. An actual switch in logic must follow a switch word.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from more switch-signaling words? Fewer? Where?

Questions. At the beginning and end of sections, "questions that guide readers" can be helpful (McTigue and Slough 2010, 221). Posing the question that's in the reader's mind at that point is a challenge, however. So is asking focused argumentative questions. Novice authors often pose a series of unrelated questions, what occurs to them in the moment, and then fail to answer or even address those questions. Your aim in posing questions should be to further the forward movement of your article and its argument, not just list unsolvable problems.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Would my article benefit from more questions? Fewer? Where?

Common Genres' Structures

Whatever structural building blocks, rhetorical order, and signals authors may use, many macrostructural problems are caused by their writing in the wrong genre. Most academics read many different genres of text, so they are steeped in many different macrostructures. The macrostructure of a mystery novel is different from the macrostructure of a newspaper article, which is different from the macrostructure of a

cookbook. Since you're in the habit of reading a variety of genres, their conventions may cause some confusion for you when you work on structuring articles. A frequent mistake of novice authors is using macrostructures that are unsuitable for journal articles. Nothing is wrong with these other structures—indeed, accomplished writers may even consciously select aspects of other genres' structures to vary the structure of their journal articles. The problem arises when these other macrostructures unconsciously influence you. Having a better understanding of them will help you avoid that.

Newspaper article structure. Many academics read newspapers and unconsciously absorb their style, which causes problems for their journal article writing. For one thing, newspaper articles are supposed to be objective, just reporting on facts and offering no interpretations. That is, most aren't organized argumentatively, so they aren't good models for journal articles. Second, these articles have an inverted-pyramid structure, in which the most important information appears first and the least important information last. Such an article doesn't circle round or even wrap up, working quite differently than a journal article. (By the way, this inverted-pyramid structure arose because of the technological limitations of print. Before publishers had computers, fitting all the articles into the allotted space was difficult, so editors needed to be able to trim articles if they ran out of space. The inverted-pyramid structure of news stories allowed for them to be cut from the bottom up if necessary without editors fearing they might be removing crucial information.) You can't write your journal article using the newspaper article structure, as you need to interpret, not just document, a variety of information (important and less so) throughout your article, not just at the beginning. And you need a solid conclusion.

Newspaper editorial structure. Many academics also read editorials in newspapers. Editorials explain a current issue, note opinions from various sides of the debate about that issue, and propose a solution or an action. Although they're persuasive and argumentative, they aren't evidence based—it's impossible to fit more than a few statistics into the five hundred words allowed for most editorials. This genre represents pure rhetoric. By contrast, journal articles are longer and thoroughly examine much evidence.

Magazine article structure. Many academics also read magazines and their "feature" articles (which also can appear in newspapers). Such articles start with a "billboard," an anecdotal narrative that captures the reader's attention and is about one to three paragraphs long. This anecdote is followed by a "lede," a sentence that announces the article's point. The lede is the pivotal part of the article, guiding readers in reading the rest of the article. The conclusion then returns the article to the narrative of the billboard. For instance, a feature might start with a billboard about Dwayne, whose mother noticed that he was gaining weight and urinating more frequently than usual. When she took him to the doctor, she found out that he had juvenile diabetes. The next sentence, the lede, might then state the point of the article that the anecdote illustrates: millions of children have undiagnosed juvenile diabetes. Often, the feature will conclude with an update to the anecdote, such as Dwayne feeling better. While journal articles in the humanities can sometimes successfully imitate the magazine

article opening by starting with an anecdote, many journal articles do not and cannot start in such a way. Further, the journal article conclusion is different, moving out to broader implications, not narrowing to the individual.

Blog post structure. Many academics read or write blogs, which can be terrific for developing thoughts and getting feedback. However, blogs are informal and highly individualized; journal articles are formal and conventional. Although it's good to develop a voice for your journal articles, that voice is more formal than that of a blog; it's as if you're speaking to the Nobel Prize committee, not your best friend. Also, blogs post ideas in process and speculate on causes and consequences; journal articles report on refined and finalized ideas based on solid research.

Mystery novel structure. Many academics read mysteries or watch them on television. Unfortunately, some unconsciously imitate mystery structure in their journal article writing, which leads to twisted structures. Many novice authors believe that readers will stop reading their article if told the argument or findings too early, so they withhold these until the end of the article, where they reveal the surprise, the equivalent of "The butler did it!" But academics don't read journal articles the way that they read mystery novels. Indeed, readers are far more likely to read your article if they have a good sense of where it is going. Further, an article that announces the argument early and summarizes what is coming is more democratic, enabling the reader to be a fellow investigator instead of a passive observer waiting for the mystery to be solved. Most of all, articles that withhold their purpose, import, or conclusions until their end often have warped microstructures and distorted macrostructures. They must actively avoid being clear so that the mystery is sustained. In the humanities, some gifted authors can pull off a mystery format, but in those few cases they provide so many clues along the way that the reader is pleased but not entirely surprised upon reaching the end.

Non-Western text structures. Many academics grew up in non-Western contexts. If you're one of them, it's vital to know that the macrostructure of articles in peer-reviewed journals is not "natural," not better than other structures—it's simply the most dominant one. As the research on "cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric" has shown, different intellectual traditions organize written knowledge in different ways, many of which yield structures that are rhetorically impressive and compelling (Connor 2002; Liu 2015). In some West African traditions, for instance, knowledge is formulated in extremely dense and allusive patterns that must be unpacked, as Karin Barber's extraordinary work on Yoruba oral verbal art demonstrates (Barber 2013). By comparison, journal articles seem boorishly direct and simplistic. Traditional Chinese texts sometimes took advantage of what was called the four-part structure or eight-legged structure, organized around successive arguments and quoting the classics (Kirkpatrick 1997; Z. Wu 2014). By comparison, journal articles seem boringly reductive and obvious. Researchers have even generalized about such cultural differences, claiming that "English academic writing is 'linear,' Chinese 'circular,' Romance languages 'digressive,' Middle Eastern languages 'parallel,' and Russian and German 'a variable of parallel'" (Straker 2016, 302, summarizing the work of McLean and Ransom 2005, 57, who were summarizing the work of Kaplan 1966). As a result, nonnative speakers of English can

find their journal articles criticized for repetition, indirectness, and too broad a scope (Kourilova-Urbanczik 2012).

Although such generalizations can be problematic, international scholars often feel relieved to learn that their struggles with journal article structure aren't caused by an innate quality of theirs, but instead arose from the different cultural rhetorics they were exposed to while growing up. The research confirms my impression, as graduate students taught about cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric showed increased recognition of the forms of academic writing (Zhou 2016). Of course, one may be "international" at home too; many in the United States grew up with different modes of knowledge production. Be aware of any non-Western writing structures that may be influencing you, and study how journal articles differ from them.

Greek oration structure. The journal article has certain rhetorical features that have persisted for thousands of years. The ancient Greeks contended that a public speech should begin with an introduction that attracts the audience (called an *exordium* in Latin) and is followed by background on the topic or issue (*narratio*). The speaker then should propose a claim or argument (*partitio*), provide evidence for the argument (*confirmatio*), and refute potential criticisms of the argument (*refutatio*). Finally, the speaker should articulate a moving conclusion, often a call to arms of some sort (*peroratio*). This ancient structure persists in the topic, thesis, evidence, and conclusion structure of most scientific articles. It also persists in the essay that many high school students learn to write: set the context (who, what, where, when); introduce the argument (why, how); provide three pieces of evidence; and conclude and/or recommend. Of course, few are listening to Greek orations these days, but it wouldn't do much harm if they were, because the orations' macrostructure is an antecedent of the journal article structure discussed in this chapter.

Report structure. Many academics are also practitioners, particularly those in international development, and must write reports on their field projects. The structure of these reports often influences their journal article drafts. But reports tend to present everything found, all the results, not a selection of evidence. These unfiltered data are why reports as reports are so valuable; but this feature also makes them bad models for journal articles, which must select the best evidence. Also, reports tend not to include arguments and can be very long and speculative, proposing untested solutions. Consequently, reports are great bases for developing journal articles, but avoiding their macrostructure is essential.

Dissertations, books, and book chapters. All academics read other scholarly genres, and even these can cause problems. A journal article is not a book or a dissertation, either of which is hundreds of pages long to explore many ideas; rather, it's twenty to forty pages on a single significant idea. Nor is a journal article a book or dissertation chapter, which can depend on the chapters before and after it to give background information and theory. Rather, it stands alone, entire and complete. Structuring a journal article as if it were a dissertation chapter is one of the most common errors.

Knowing the multiplicity of writing structures can help you write better journal articles, preventing unsuitable macrostructures from creeping into your academic writing.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Which other genre structures may have crept into my article? For instance, does it end with the least important information, lack a conclusion, insufficiently analyze evidence, lack formality, withhold findings, lack an argument, or run too long?

TYPES OF JOURNAL ARTICLE MACROSTRUCTURES

Returning to journal article structure, some disciplines use more standardized structures than others do. The sciences have absolute formulas; the humanities have looser ones; the social sciences vary along a spectrum. Those in the sciences sometimes wish that their structures were less rigid; those in the humanities sometimes wish that they had simple formulaic structures they could follow. The good news is that you can improve your writing by knowing the structuring principles of other disciplines.

SciQua Macrostructure

Quantitative, experimental, and many qualitative articles follow what is called an IMRD (sometimes IMRaD) structure, an acronym for the order of the articles' sections: Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. This type of article moves from why and how the scholars obtained the results to what the results mean. Each section has a specific format organized around the research question. The IMRD structure has an hourglass shape, because it starts out with a broad focus in the introduction, proceeds to a narrow focus in the methods and results, and then opens back out to a broad view in the discussion. (This movement of prose is also reflected in Hayot's Uneven U order.)

Here is a bit more detail about SciQua macrostructure, provided in outline form.

1. Section I—Inverted-pyramid structure, moving from general to specific
   a. Introduction—general subject of investigation (often a social problem)
   b. Review of the literature—literature on the subject of investigation (gaps and lacks)
   c. Statement of the hypothesis—your argument in the context of other work
2. Section M—Specific description of study, all information needed to replicate study
   a. Methods
   b. Procedures
   c. Materials and instruments
   d. Experiment
   e. Context and setting
   f. Population or sample
3. Section R—Specific description of results
   a. Results—report on findings (often with tables and graphs)
4. Section D—Pyramid structure, moving from the specific of results to the general
   a. Discussion—comment on validity of methods and findings
   b. Conclusions—place research in the context of the scholarly literature

Notably, some scientific disciplines don't use IMRD macrostructures. Mathematics articles, for instance, only have an introduction and a Results section because their methods are established, and discussion isn't necessary to interpret the results (Graves, Moghaddasi, and Hashim 2013).

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Do I use this SciQua macrostructure? And/or does it spark any ideas about how to structure my article?

HumInt Macrostructure

Humanities and interpretive social science articles usually have an essayistic macrostructure. Like SciQua articles, HumInt articles have introductions, but these vary. For instance, the HumInt macrostructure lacks an hourglass shape; the author doesn't separate the evidence (results) from the interpretation (discussion). Rather, interpretation occurs continuously in HumInt macrostructure, as the author walks the reader through multiple layers of thinking through a question. The author presents evidence, interprets that evidence, suggests how that evidence supports the argument, and repeats this process until satisfied that the argument is convincing. To put it another way, as the literature scholar Rachel Bergmann astutely said to me, "Social science articles *report* on their experiment, while humanities articles *stage* their experiment."

Although HumInt macrostructure can differ quite a bit internally, many HumInt articles look something like this:

I. Introduction
   A. Vivid example/problem/anecdote/text, often communicating who, what, why, where, when
   B. Review of the scholarly debate and/or general perception of the subject
   C. Statement of author's argument relevant to context, debate, and perceptions
   D. Claim for the significance of the subject, approach, or argument
   E. Synopsis of article structure and points
II. Body
   A. Background (e.g., subject context, including history, region, period, group)
   B. Analysis of something
      1. Describes the thing under analysis (e.g., text[s]/passage[s], individual[s]/group[s], artwork[s], case[s], theme[s], event[s], proposition[s], principle[s])
      2. States the subargument about that thing
      3. Analyzes that thing, plus any other relevant things
      4. Often considers any relevant insights about that thing in the work of other scholars
      5. Sometimes addresses possible counterarguments
      6. Sums up what was discovered, found, concluded, and inferred so far, and sets up the next section
   C. Analysis of something else (i.e., section B above repeats once, twice, up to five or six times)
III. Summing up (how all the things, scholarship, discoveries, and argument relate)

IV. Conclusion
   A. Why these discoveries are fascinating
   B. Why this article is a contribution to the scholarly debate and/or field

Because HumInt macrostructure varies so much, it's wise to study the structure of articles in your discipline.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Do I use a HumInt macrostructure? And/or does it spark any ideas about how to structure my article?

Disciplinary Macrostructures

Dedicated study of articles in your discipline or field can help you detect their article structure formulas. Some participants in my workshops have sent me their findings (and you are welcome to do the same!). Scholars have also published their research on disciplinary macrostructures. Here's information about three of these.

Linguistics. One author in my workshop found some standardization among articles in her discipline of linguistics. The articles tended to be thirty to thirty-five pages in length with abstracts of 150–250 words. They had short introductions followed by literature reviews of three to five pages that reviewed approximately forty to fifty citations. After a short Methods section, they proceeded to the analysis or discussion, which typically took up about 75 percent of the article and was organized around the debate announced in the literature review. Most articles had a summarizing conclusion.

Applied linguistics. Two scholars have formally studied articles in applied linguistics, finding that they often strayed from the IMRD structure. For instance, these articles often included the theoretical background, the related literature, or background information in sections *after* the introduction, in the body of the article (Ruiying and Allison 2003, 2004). Frequently, applied linguistics articles also had a section before the conclusion about the pedagogical implications of the research. In addition, the body of the articles consisted of argumentation, but of three different types. One body type was oriented toward theory, pursuing a series of subarguments. Another type had a problem-solution format. The last type had a problem-solution format but added a component on the application of the solution. I mention these variations in applied linguistics as an example of how disciplines can vary from the ostensibly universal rules for structuring articles.

Anthropology. One author studied articles in her discipline of anthropology and found that they devoted half their space to reviewing the literature and related theories, contrary to my advice not to spend too much time on others' ideas. Most had literature reviews at least eight pages long and reviewed three different bodies of literature. Many of the articles also had, near the beginning, about two paragraphs of background on the field site and population. Just as this author had, test my advice by studying the norms of articles in your discipline. If they differ from what I said, follow your disciplinary norms, not my advice!

Synaptic Macrostructure

Over the years that I have taught my writing workshop, a contingent of humanities students has argued against rigid article structures. They insist that some published articles are not so argument driven but instead pose a question, move poetically and nonlinearly through a process of discovery, and reveal an answer only in the conclusion (if then). Such articles proceed with merely the promise of an answer or with only a provisional argument that cannot be understood until the piece has been read through. Argument is not a structure but a plot, these students say, a seductive puzzle that foments critical desire and depends on a deferred closure. I call such articles "synaptic," since they proceed by sparking readers' imaginations, lighting up synapses like fireworks with a series of epiphanies, which are only loosely related.

In my warning to authors against stringing together insights without any organizing principle, perhaps I *am* prohibiting the development of more sophisticated, intuitive, and open articles. If it's your heart's desire to write such articles, go for it. But let me give a few warnings that may help you be successful with the form. First, many readers resist reading such articles because they're more difficult to read or skim, and readers have only so much time. As one workshop participant wittily put it, "I find it tough to read them because I'm constantly debating if the author is a genius or just confused." Even if you're dedicated to the synaptic style, still attempt to provide some of the structure that aids readers. Increasingly, I see synaptic articles that still have extremely clear, nonsynaptic introductions. Fred Moten's much-cited article "Blackness and Nothingness (Mysticism in the Flesh)" is a good example (Moten 2013). Another is Jeff Dolven's article "Panic's Castle," which has all the pleasures of an allusive, elliptical, and lyrical prose style, yet a rock-solid structure and an admirably brief statement of the argument on the second page: "Panic, and the fear of panic, are the generative principles of *The Faerie Queene*" (Dolven 2012, 2). Second, many novice authors are attracted to writing high theory because that's what they read most in graduate school. And it seems like writing theory is what the smartest do. Yet in fact, the clear majority of what is published is not high theory. Again, if you truly love reading and writing theory, and others tell you that you do it well, absolutely do it. But don't misunderstand the profession. It's not mostly about pure theory. Third, you face an uphill battle in getting published, as the journals that publish synaptic articles are getting rarer. Make sure the journal to which you're sending your material publishes them. Also, if you're not tenured, consider writing some conventionally structured articles as well so that your odds of getting published are better.

Either through consulting your article or just from memory, answer the following:

Do I use the synaptic macrostructure? If so, should I write a less synaptic introduction or conclusion?

TYPES OF PRE- AND POSTDRAFT OUTLINING

While most of us think about article outlining as a task authors perform *before* they start writing, creating an outline *after* you've written a draft is perhaps the most valuable step you can take to improve your structure. Outlining something already written is called a postdraft outline. (Note that some incorrectly call this reverse outlining, which is a different technique, according to Crabbs, Allan, and Crabbs [1985].) Any time you feel like

you're beginning to lose control of the article is a good time to make a postdraft outline. Many of us discover through this exercise that the article isn't doing what we thought it was doing. Outlining it can then help us feel calmer, more certain about the way forward. This week, you'll be required to outline a published article and your own. Many novice authors have found making a postdraft outline to be the most useful exercise in the whole workbook, so don't skip it.

Most of us learned the traditional method of outlining, which is linear, using numbers and letters to indicate primary and secondary ideas, and often including subheadings and parts of topic sentences, as demonstrated in the outlines of the SciQua and HumInt macrostructures given earlier. The traditional method works great for many people, but if you feel like it's boxing you in, you can use one of the methods that follow for either your pre- or your postdraft outlining.

Map outline. If you're visually oriented, you might want to draw a map of your article. You can use words or symbols to represent the article's ideas and their relationships to one another. This process can help you identify your topic or narrow it, especially if you feel like language sometimes confines you. A map outline can be more flexible, as it enables you to see in more directions and notice omitted material. Its drawback is that it doesn't always make clear any breaks in structure or logical progression.

Flowchart outline. If you're visually oriented, a flowchart may work better than a map, as it forces you to indicate relationships between all items with arrows and hierarchy. Argument-mapping software often aids in making flowchart outlines. Some use different shapes for different elements of the chart, such as circles for evidence and triangles for argument.

Storyboard outline. If you're visually oriented, another technique, one used in producing movies and television programs, is a storyboard, which resembles a cartoon panel. If your journal article is describing objects or telling a story, you may find it helpful to sketch key moments in your article, including captions and imagined reader responses.

Make-it-social outline. Narrate the story of your article to someone else. For instance, "I start here, I go there, and I'm a little confused on where I go next. I need to get there." See whether articulating your postdraft outline aloud gives you clarity.

Herrera Motivation Outline. The popular-performance scholar Brian Herrera proposes what he calls a Motivation Outline. Inspired by Konstantin Stanislavski's system for training actors, which requires actors to think deeply about what motivates the character they are portraying, Herrera's outline method tracks the author's own motivations in writing. Herrera told me that focusing exclusively on the reader's motivations for reading doesn't help him structure his articles. Rather, he also needs to articulate his own motivations, in part because he can't always state them directly in the article, for the sake of politeness (e.g., "This critic is doing active harm in the world with this theory and needs to be stopped"). So his outline has two columns. In the left column is a traditional outline; in the right column he lists his motivations, or what he calls "big ideas," for each section of the article. In the workshop where he presented this outlining method,

authors who perceived academic readers as different from themselves—as largely white, straight, and male US readers—found that this dual way of thinking about both the readers' and the author's motivations was incredibly useful. They believed that it would help them avoid losing themselves in the demands of their profession.

As an example, below is a postdraft Motivation Outline Herrera produced for an article he published after attending many college performances of the Latinx drama *In the Heights* (Herrera 2017). I added the material in brackets to indicate the number of paragraphs in that section of the article.

Brian Herrera's Motivation Outline
for "'But Do We Have the Actors for That?': Some Principles of Practice for Staging Latinx Plays in a University Theatre Context" (Herrera 2017)

Opening: [7 paragraphs] Provocation [3] Lit Review [2] Guidepost/Thesis [2]	Motivation/Big Idea: Must think through these enduring questions about staging in emphatically different ways
Method: [8 paragraphs] What I did When I did it Where I did it How I did it Why I did it	Motivation/Big Idea: University theater departments' largely unacknowledged and paradoxical status as simultaneously professional and amateur
Material: [7 paragraphs] Why *In the Heights* is so well suited for this experiment	Motivation/Big Idea: Uninterrogated presumptions underlying the tradition of pan-Latinx casting often collapses in the university context
Proposal—3 principles of staging practice [12 paragraphs] First proposed principle (short) [3] Second proposed principle (medium length) [3] Third proposed principle (longest, most complex) [6]	Motivation/Big Idea: Clear leadership is required to create and maximize opportunity for all
Closing: [3 paragraphs] Reflective summary of Big Ideas/Motivations	Motivation/Big Idea: College theater can be a transformative site for diversity in theater if leaders embrace opportunity

Klima Question Outline. On his website, the academic writing coach Alan Klima proposes what he calls a Question Outline method (Klima 2016). Unlike a conventional outline, which is organized around statements and information, the Question Outline includes only questions. Klima points out that readers read an article to find answers to questions, so organizing your outline around questions keeps you focused on the readers. Also, asking questions helps you think more clearly about the logical order of your ideas. That is, if you ask a question and answer it, then you must ask what question follows from that answer. So instead of writing your outline with items like "1A. Definition of *branding*," you would write, "1A. What is your definition of *branding*?" Watch Klima's video about this method to learn his advice about which types of ques-

tions work best; for instance, he recommends that you not ask "how" questions but instead ask "in what ways" questions.

Which of these outlining techniques speak to me? Which one will I try this week?

REVISING YOUR STRUCTURE

Day 1 Tasks: Reading the Workbook

On the first day of your ninth writing week, read this week 9 chapter all the way through the next paragraph, answering all the questions posed. Write directly in the boxes provided or in your own document.

Tracking Writing Time

Each day, use the Calendar for Actual Time Spent Writing This Week form (or digital time-tracking software) to keep track of the time you spent writing this week. Then, at the end of the week, evaluate how you spent your time.

If busy, at least mark the check boxes with how long you wrote today. ☐ 15+ min. ☐ 30+ ☐ 60+ ☐ 120+

WEEK 9, DAYS 2-5: READING AND TASKS

Day 2 Tasks: Outlining Someone Else's Published Article

Today you'll outline a good published article as a step toward outlining your own. Select an article you admire that was published in the last year (perhaps the good article you examined in week 3), one that does well what you want to do in your article.

Then, using one of the techniques from the "Types of Pre- and Postdraft Outlining" section above, outline that article in no more than one page. On the outline, next to each bullet point, subheading, or image, note how many paragraphs, pages, and/or words are in each section. Are there parts in that other person's article that surprised you by being shorter or longer than you thought they would be? Does the article use subheadings? Does it use charts, tables, or other illustrations? Where are they, and how long? Study when the argument appears. How early is it? Calculate how many citations the article has. Are there more or fewer citations than you thought there would be? In general, what are the implications of this article as a model for yours? Note that the article may do some things well and other things badly, and that's okay—study it all. Identifying what you don't want to do is also helpful.

If interested, outline other articles in your field, perhaps going back to articles you already read in previous weeks. If you do enough of these exercises, you'll begin to see what is typical in your discipline or field, which will help you immensely when writing.

Tracking Writing Time

Mark your electronic calendar, the Calendar for Actual Time Spent Writing This Week form, and/or the check boxes here with how long you wrote today. ☐ 15+ min. ☐ 30+ ☐ 60+ ☐ 120+

Day 3 Tasks: Making a Postdraft Outline of Your Article

Today you'll create a postdraft outline of your article as it stands; then you'll study its structure. This will help you determine whether your article is coherent and cohesive. If it isn't, then you'll create a new outline of the structure of your article as you would like it to be. This process has four steps, using a printout or other locked form of your article.

1. Highlight Your Article's Current Structure

A couple of weeks ago, you went through your article, highlighting your evidence in green and your interpretation in blue. This week, you'll go through your article highlighting structure and terms.

Structure. Every time you find structure signals, such as summing-up sentences or subheadings, highlight them in PURPLE.

Subject terms. Then, every time you find your key terms and subject of study, highlight them in GREEN. Thus, if your article is an argument that the plant-based paints used in some well-known Byzantine religious icons suggest that these works date to the seventh century, earlier than previously thought, then the words *paint*, *icon*, *seventh century*, and perhaps *plant* should be appearing regularly and together, not just one per paragraph.

Argument. Every time you find statements of the argument, highlight them in BLUE. It's okay if you highlight argument hints and subarguments.

2. Analyze the Article's Current Structure

Now, flip through the print version of the article, or change your screen view to 50 percent so that you can see the entire page at one time, to answer the following questions:

Purple: Structure

Does my article use (enough) subheadings? As mentioned, subheadings help you as the author as well as your readers. Subheadings should consist of informative words, but even three asterisks standing alone between sections help signal a new section to the reader. Many word-processing programs, including Microsoft Word and Scrivener, now boost the effect of subheadings by providing authors with ways to see them in a sidebar onscreen, helping writers keep their whole work in mind. (If you use Microsoft Word, always use the Styles feature to code heads so that they'll appear in the navigation sidebar.) Check to ensure that you have subheadings at least every five to seven pages or more frequently, depending on standards in your field or discipline.

Could my article use more subheadings? If so, mark where.	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article have a synopsis? If you're using the SciQua macrostructure discussed earlier, you don't need a synopsis of your article. If you're using the HumInt macrostructure, consider including a short one at the end of the introduction.

Could my article use a synopsis? If so, mark where.	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article use (enough) summing up? As mentioned, summing up aids the reader. Good summing up at the ends of sections and even some paragraphs moves the article forward by articulating your argument and providing strong links between what has been said and what will be said. Note that *summary* and *summing up* aren't the same thing. An example of a *summary* is, "I covered *x*, *y*, and *z* in the last section and will now move to consider *a*, *b*, and *c*." An example of *summing up* is, "In other words, while we cannot claim that *x* causes *y*, because the evidence simply doesn't support it, we can say that *x* and *y* are correlated in an intriguing way. The meaning of that correlation is what I turn to next." Check your article to ensure that purple summings-up are appearing regularly at the ends of sections. If they're missing, write a note about what summing up there would look like.

Could my article use more summing up? If so, mark where.	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Are my article sections about the right length? One trick to keep any one section from being too long is to calculate the number of pages you have for each section, using your subheadings. If your HumInt article is twenty-four pages long, that means you have one or two pages available for your introduction, one or two pages for your conclusion, one or two pages for a background section (if you have one), and four or five pages for each of your four sections (or eight pages for each of your two sections, etc.). If your SciQua article is twenty-four pages long, you have one or two pages available for your introduction, one to three pages for your Methods, four to seven pages for your Results, and ten to fifteen pages for your Discussion. Of course, your article doesn't have to be exactly even, but if your Methods section is ten pages and your Discussion is two pages, you have a structural problem.

How long are my sections? Does their page length suggest that some are too long or too short?	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Green: Subject Terms

Do my subject terms appear regularly? If important subject terms are disappearing for pages at a time, you have a structure problem. So for instance, if your article is a gender analysis of credit card use, *gender* and *credit card* should be appearing in nearly every paragraph. Also, "the repeating of key or thesis concepts is especially helpful at points of transition from one section to another, to show how the new section fits in" (Harvey 2009, 1). Do you rightly see green subject terms appearing in every section, especially at the end? Or, do you go many paragraphs without those green terms appearing?

Could my article use more appearances of my key terms? If so, mark where.	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article digress? Everyone knows that they shouldn't digress, but not everyone is ruthless about identifying what is relevant and what isn't. For instance, an article about drug use among homeless teenagers should not have long passages about teen pregnancy. Teen pregnancy is related indirectly, not directly. If a paragraph has no green terms, maybe it's a digression you should cut. One easy check is to ask yourself whether

you could drop that paragraph wholesale without disrupting the argument or creating a visible absence in the text. If so, you should probably drop it.

Does the lack of green terms in any paragraph suggest that I should cut it?	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Blue: Argument

Is my argument appearing regularly? Unlike a book or chapter, you must carefully organize your article around a single significant idea, your argument. You worked on this before, in week 2, but it's time to look at argument again, now that you've worked on the evidence. Many problems with structure arise from the author's failure to relate the specific, usually evidence, to the general, usually the theory or argument. Make sure each section and paragraph relates to your single significant idea. Now, check everywhere you highlighted your article in blue (argument). Do you see blue in the introduction and not after? Does the argument fall out of the entire middle of your article? We should get a sense of your argument in the title, see it clearly in the abstract, again in the introduction, at least once in each section of the article, and clearly in the conclusion. If you can do this organically, simply by logical flow, great. If not, feel free to provide signposting.

Is my argument appearing regularly? If not, mark where it should.	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Other Structure Issues

Does my article wrongly have a discovery structure? It's perfectly acceptable to mention in your article the origins of your idea or how you came to notice something elusive, that is, to provide a narrative of the discovery process. What isn't acceptable is to structure your article according to that process. Only rarely will an article structured by the order in which you discovered the evidence provide a strong and satisfying structure. (An order derived from the order in which you retrieved evidence from memory is unlikely to work well either.) Organize your notes, evidence, and article by theme and topic instead. Elements learned during the discovery process should emerge in the article, but rarely in the order in which you discovered them. Check the order of sections and evidence in your article, ensuring that they are organized by your ideas about them, not your discovery of them. Remember, write like a lawyer, not like a detective.

Should my article use less discovery-process structure? If so, how might it be differently structured?	☐ No ☐ I'm not sure ◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article wrongly have a mystery novel structure? As mentioned earlier, don't withhold the purpose, import, or conclusions until the end of the article. Nothing is more likely to help you structure your article properly than to avoid mystery. If you're committed to the mystery structure, much like the synaptic structure, remember that the best mysteries give many clues, so that the revelation isn't a true surprise. Check

your last section and conclusion to ensure that you aren't withholding information the readers needed earlier.

Should my article use less mystery novel structure? If so, what should I move up?	☐ No	☐ I'm not sure	◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article repeat itself? When you outline your article as a whole, you often find that you repeat the same information in different places. Reading your article in one sitting helps you detect such repetition, even if it's widely spaced in the article.

Do some paragraphs repeat information that appeared earlier? If so, where will I cut that repetition?	☐ No	☐ I'm not sure	◯ Yes (to do)

Does my article ask questions it does not answer? Do a search for every question mark in your article. Especially note anywhere you have a series of questions together. Are they on point? Do you answer them? If you pose questions, be sure to track through the article whether you address and answer them.

Do I answer the questions posed? If not, should I delete them or add answers?	☐ No	☐ I'm not sure	◯ Yes (to do)

Does material from one section creep into another section? In a SciQua article, methods, results, and discussion should be quite separate. Methods shouldn't wander into the Results section; discussion shouldn't wander into the Results section. Check your article to ensure that this creep hasn't happened.

Are my Methods, Results, and Discussion sections suitably separate? If not, what should be moved?	☐ No	☐ I'm not sure	◯ Yes (to do)

3. Outline Your Article's Current Structure

Using the instructions for outlining given on day 1 this week, create an outline of your article as it stands. If you find the task of outlining tough, it may be because your article lacks a strong enough structure. Poorly constructed paragraphs with discordant ideas are difficult to outline. If you're tempted to stop outlining the current structure and start drafting your article's future structure, resist. Instead, complete both tasks. It's essential that you outline the whole article as it stands, not just through the part where you decide you don't like the current structure.

4. Outline a New Structure for Your Article

If you found your structure to be solid, you can skip this step. But if you found structure problems, start a new outline of your article, creating the structure you'd like the article to have. Indicate where you would add summing up, subtract digressions, or move state-

ments of your argument to a more prominent position. You can use the outline of the published article you made earlier this week to aid in your restructuring.

Tracking Writing Time

Mark your electronic calendar, the Calendar for Actual Time Spent Writing This Week form, and/or the check boxes here with how long you wrote today. ☐ 15+ min. ☐ 30+ ☐ 60+ ☐ 120+

Days 4–5 Tasks: Restructuring Your Article

Today and tomorrow, you will start correcting any structural problems you found and, if necessary, restructuring your article around that new outline.

This task of restructuring poses several challenges, as noted by Rachel Cawley, a writing expert who also recommends outlining drafts in her blog *Explorations of Style*. In her instructions, she acknowledges that the process of restructuring is often "scary," as authors fear that they "might take away existing coherence and flow without being able to replace it with something better." Indeed, if you just move the paragraphs around without revising them, you'll find that your article will "bear too many traces of its earlier self" (Cawley 2011). But if you follow your plan, and carefully review the new draft for cohesion, editing where necessary for logical flow, you'll witness the article coming together in a much stronger way. Even after all these years of writing, I still end up regularly restructuring my prose. While I'm in the middle of that restructuring, I always feel profound doubt; but when I'm done, I'm glad I did it. A couple of times I decided that something about the original order was better, but the solution to its problems became clear only through the restructuring, so I'm still glad to have done all that work.

Once finished, you may find it helpful to return to the questions I asked you to answer without reading your article in the sections "Article-Structuring Principles" and "Types of Journal Article Macrostructures." Check whether you have now solved those problems.

Checking Progress

If you have a little extra time, you have three tasks you could consider. First, this might be a good moment to make a list of remaining tasks, taking stock of where you are in the process of revising the article and what tasks remain. Second, if you haven't sent out your query letter yet (see the advice in week 4), now is a good week to do so. Third, in week 6, you had a chance to exchange your article with someone else. If you didn't feel ready then, this is an excellent week to get others' responses to your article. If you still have doubts about your article's worth or the time you're spending on it, sharing it with someone can reinvigorate your commitment to it. If you do have an exchange, use the instructions in week 6 for giving and getting feedback.

Tracking Writing Time

Mark your electronic calendar, the Calendar for Actual Time Spent Writing This Week form, and/or the check boxes here with how long you wrote both days. ☐ 15+ min. ☐ 30+ ☐ 60+ ☐ 120+

Then, here at the end of your workweek, take pride in your accomplishments and evaluate whether any patterns need changing.