Research in Nursing & Health, 1998, 21, 375–382

Writing A Good Read: Strategies for Re-Presenting Qualitative Data

Margarete Sandelowski*

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Nursing, Department of Women's & Children's Health, #7460 Carrington Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599
Received 15 April 1997; accepted 8 August 1997

Abstract: One key element in the successful dissemination and utilization of qualitative findings is the well-written research report. In contrast to quantitative research, there is no one style for reporting the findings from qualitative research. Qualitative researchers must select from an array of representational styles and formats those that best fit their research purposes, methods, and data. Qualitative researchers must attend to the balance among description, analysis, and interpretation, choose whether to emphasize character, setting, or plot, determine whose perspectives or voices will prevail, and treat metaphors seriously. Strategies for re-presenting qualitative data include using time, theme, sensitizing concepts, and coding families. © 1998 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Res Nurs Health, 21: 375–382, 1998

Keywords: qualitative research; writing; qualitative representation

Words, rather than the events themselves, will be remembered. (Hilberg, 1996, p. 83)

One of the most important barriers to the utilization of research is the typical research report, that is, its lack of clarity, intelligibility, and relevance except to a very limited audience (Funk, Tornquist, & Champagne, 1995). Qualitative research reports, no less than quantitative ones, have hindered the utilization of qualitative findings. Whereas quantitative researchers may turn off their readers with jargon high on statistical, but low on clinical, significance, qualitative researchers may offend with turgid prose, seemingly endless lists of unlinked codes and categories, dangling participles, and dizzying arrays of multiply hyphenated and, sometimes, nonexistent words that convey nothing more than the writer's willingness (albeit unintended) to destroy the English language. Indeed, a discussion of writing ought not to be seen as yet another digression on the part of nurse researchers away from science and substance, but rather as a necessary move toward enhancing research utilization. The artistic can and must be reconciled with the actionable in the write-up. The research write-up is one critical way that researchers make a difference, so they must learn to do this work as well as they can. Especially for qualitative researchers, "writing well is neither a luxury nor an option . . . it is absolutely essential" (Wolcott, 1990, p. 13).

My purpose in this article is to focus on the write-up as an end product of qualitative research, or on strategies for presenting qualitative findings that will be read, make sense, and have impact. I do not address writing as means or "method of inquiry" (Richardson, 1994, p. 516), nor the memos, field notes, journals, audit trails, data displays, and other writing techniques aimed at analysis and documentation. Moreover, although writing (as means) and write-up (as end) in qualitative research entail an array of epistemological, ethical, and political controversies encompassed in what has been called the "crisis of representation" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 9) of the Other, my take on the write-up here is strictly practical and focuses on ways to structure qualitative findings largely within "realist" conventions of scientific reporting (Hunter, 1990; Van Maanen, 1988). Although I do suggest stretching the boundaries of these conventions, I do not address here alterna-

*Professor.

© 1998 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. CCC 0160-6891/98/040375-08

tive written re-presentations of qualitative data, such as the novel (Krieger, 1983) and drama (Paget, 1993a, 1993b), or experimental alternatives to written re-presentations, such as dance (Blumenfeld-Jones, 1995).

"ONE NARRATIVE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL"

Arguably, the most important difference between reports of the findings of qualitative and quantitative research is in choice of format. For quantitative researchers, the format is, for the most part, there before they start writing. That is, there is an expectation that the findings will be organized in the *results* section according to the hypotheses stated, the research questions asked, or the variables compared. The results of the statistical tests performed for each hypothesis, question, or set of variables are addressed in turn. The *discussion* section is similarly organized, devoted to researchers' explanations for the findings, which are intercut with references to literature. No researcher explanations or references to existing literature are permitted in the results section.

In contrast, there is no one style for reporting the findings from qualitative research. Qualitative researchers must choose not only what "story" they will tell, but also how they will tell it (Wolcott, 1990, p. 18). Qualitative researchers must select from an array of representational styles, formats, and "language(s) of disclosure" (Thornton, 1987, p. 27) those that best fit their research purposes, methods, and data (Knafl & Howard, 1984). As Tierney (1995, p. 389) noted, "one narrative size does not fit all."

Determining the Point or Story

A critical first step qualitative researchers must take as they contemplate the write-up is to determine its central point, or story line. Qualitative researchers must choose which story, of the many stories available to them in a data set, to tell in a given article or book chapter. A very wise teacher once told me that if writers could not state the point of a paper in one sentence, they did not yet know what the point was. Writing—as thinking on paper or on screen—helps move the qualitative researcher to the one and only point around which the write-up will be organized.

A common problem in analysis, which manifests itself in the research report, is the retelling of participants' stories, as opposed to the transformation of these data through analysis and interpretation. Here researchers will summarize as much as they can of their data, in the hopes of getting it all in, and of achieving the much-touted "thick description," without getting to the point of what any of these data mean. By erring on the side of "descriptive excess" (J. Lofland & L. Lofland, 1995, p. 165), these researchers are, at best, presenting only a very preliminary form of analysis aimed at surveying or getting a sense of what they have in their data, rather than making any sense of their data. Their presentations are comprised of unconnected and undigested bits of description followed by a quotation or two, which may or may not reflect or extend these data.

After getting the data, the major task in qualitative research is to "get rid of it" [sic] (Wolcott, 1990, p. 18) by using data selectively to exemplify, illustrate, or illuminate the story the writer wants to tell. "Heaped data" (Wolcott, 1994, p. 13) are not equal to thick description, are not likely to lead readers to the point of an article, and indicate that the writer is still unclear about what the point is. By trying to retell everything, writers end up showing nothing.

Moreover, as Coffey and Atkinson (1996, p. 153) observed, "the generation of ideas can never be dependent on the data alone. Data are there to think with and to think about." Writing is a mode of discovery that takes researchers where they should be by the time they get to the write-up: "beyond" (p. 153) their data. The important ideas will not be "in" the data themselves, no matter how "obsessively" they are "scrutinized" (pp. 154–155). Writers can err also on the side of "analytic excess" (J. Lofland & L. Lofland, 1995, p. 164) when, preoccupied with establishing the credibility of their work, they emphasize the mechanics of analysis (multiple word lists and data displays) without ever presenting a coherent rendering of the events or individuals studied.

Balancing Description, Analysis, and Interpretation

Another of the most important decisions that qualitative researchers have to make is how to balance description, analysis, and interpretation (J. Lofland & L. Lofland, 1995; Wolcott, 1994). Description here refers to the "facts" of the cases observed: analysis, to the breakdown and recombinations of data that allow researchers to manage and see them in new ways; and interpretation, to the new meanings researchers create from their treatment of data.

Qualitative researchers' choices about what they will emphasize in their write-ups must fit the research purposes and methods. For example, if the purpose of a qualitative descriptive study was to determine how a particular group of women viewed aging, most of the presentation ought to emphasize description of their views, with minimal analytic or interpretive intrusions from the researcher. These women's views would be represented in ways that economically and faithfully captured common and idiosyncratic themes in the interview data, with the women's words paraphrased or quoted to illustrate these views. The data "star" (Chenail, 1995) here because the researcher/writer does not stray far from the data and the data are allowed, with some help from the writer, to "speak for themselves" (Wolcott, 1994, p. 10). The writing task is to ensure that the reader hears these women, with minimal voice-overs by the researcher. The writer must reduce the volume of data, but amplify the women's voices.

In contrast, if the purpose of a grounded theory study was to determine how the same group of women manage aging, most of the presentation ought to emphasize the researcher's theoretical reformulation of the data, with the data themselves appearing only to support the theory. Grounded theory re-presentations should emphasize the expected interpretive products of grounded theory studies: namely, the theories themselves. Data are used only to show how a theory was constructed, and that it was indeed constructed from these data. Although grounded theories must be faithful renderings of experience, there is no mandate in grounded theory write-ups, as there is in studies whose central purpose is to foreground the perspectives and voices of individual participants, for the reader to see or hear every person whose experiences contributed to the theory. Data are not the stars here; instead, they play important, but supporting roles in the service of showing and validating what researchers did to (i.e., how they analyzed), and made of, their data (i.e., their interpretations).

Emphasizing Character, Scene, or Plot

Qualitative researchers might also consider whether the story they want to tell is best told by emphasizing, and consciously using devices to showcase, character, scene, or plot. Scientific typologies of human behavior are analogous to character studies in literature, as are setting to scene or landscape, and complicating action to plot (Nisbet, 1976; Roberts, 1995). Like character, typologies of human behavior can be disclosed by describing what persons do in certain situations, what they say, and/or what others say about them. May's (1980) grounded theory study of fathering styles is an example. Like scene or landscape, setting can be disclosed by describing the physical, cultural, and symbolic environment in and against which human beings live and act. Ethnographies often are characterized by great attention to the spatial and symbolic boundaries in which human events occur, as in Koenig's (1988) study of plasma exchange technology. Like plot, complicating action can be disclosed by delineating cause and effect, and the conflicts and dilemmas initiating or resulting from events. In a grounded theory study, Sandelowski, Harris, and Holditch-Davis (1989) emphasized the complications and choices characterizing infertile couples' quest for a child.

Taking Point of View and Voice Seriously

Qualitative researchers also must determine whose point of view or voice will prevail in their write-ups. This decision involves thorny issues concerning authorial presence and power. For example, the writing conventions for the typical scientific research report demand the researcher/writers' absence from the write-up, paradoxically, in order to shore up claims for that writer's "interpretive omnipotence" (Van Maanen, 1988, p. 51). The *I saw* is removed in favor of the *this was seen*, with the writer returning to have the last word on how to see the *what was seen.*

In the example offered previously of the qualitative descriptive study of women's views of aging, the narrative stance of the writer might be as reporter, or as both reporter and interpreter of these women's perspectives. The task for writers is to be clear themselves, and then to convey clearly to their readers when they are moving from research participants' accounts to their own accounts of these accounts. For example, the statement that the women viewed aging with ambivalence, followed by data to support this statement, signals to readers that the writer is summarizing the data around a common theme she or he discerned in the data. The writer is using the "third-person objective point of view" (Roberts, 1995, p. 81), communicating what "the women," "she," or "they" said. The writer reports in summary form only what she or he has heard, not what she or he has surmised.

When the writer follows this summary with the statement that women's ambivalent views toward aging reflect a Western cultural ambivalence to-

ward aging women, the writer has moved from the third-person objective to the third-person "omniscient" (Roberts, 1995, p. 81) point of view, in that she or he is offering her or his own take on what the women said. The simplest way not to confuse these stances is to use the conventional research reporting style in which the results of a study (i.e., women's perspectives on aging) are separated from the discussion of those results (i.e., the researcher's take on those perspectives). When researchers choose to juxtapose their participants' accounts with their own in the same section of the write-up, the distinction between stances can be signalled by a change in paragraph or by the explicit reinsertion of the writer into the write-up. The writer might switch to the first-person point of view by writing, "I discerned in these women's views the Western cultural ambivalence toward aging women."

Qualitative researchers must take seriously the stances they assume in their write-ups, if only because of their emphasis on showcasing participants' points of view. Indeed, qualitative researchers often defend the value, and even superiority, of qualitative over quantitative research by proclaiming that qualitative research is from the perspectives or voices of the research participants. Yet, in too many write-ups of qualitative findings of studies, where the researcher's stated purpose was to showcase the participants, the views or voices of the researcher still prevail, or the views or voices of very different participants are quickly reduced to one voice. Moreover, because of the way findings are written, readers may find it difficult to determine when participant or researcher is speaking. If writers are really serious about including multiple points of view, or having "polyvocal texts" (Richardson, 1994, p. 521), they will use writing formats that yield them, for example, layouts that actually juxtapose varying views about an event, including the researcher's. Such writing formats demand that journal editors and publishers permit them.

Taking Metaphors Seriously

The metaphor is a "literary device (that) is the backbone of social (and much biological) science writing" (Richardson, 1994, p. 519). Although typically dismissed as unscientific, human (including scientific) thought is "almost inconceivable" (Nisbet, 1976, p. 32) without the use of metaphor. Metaphor is a "way of knowing" (Nisbet, 1976, p. 33) and re-presenting "one thing in terms of another" (Richardson, 1994, p. 519), as Richardson did by describing the metaphor itself as a spine. Metaphors are so integral to scientific texts that they go unnoticed. Yet, they exert their effects by reflecting, reinforcing, and even "privileging" (Richardson, 1994, p. 520) particular views and values. Feminist and cultural studies scholars, in particular, have demonstrated the metaphoric nature of science texts generally presumed to be devoid of such literary frills (e.g., Martin, 1990; Treichler, 1990).

Because metaphors are an integral component of scientific and literary texts, and qualitative researchers draw from the sciences and arts in their write-ups (Eisner, 1981), writers of qualitative research findings have an obligation to understand and use metaphor well. A common error in reporting the findings of qualitative research is not taking metaphors seriously enough (Becker, 1986, p. 85), which occurs when writers do not follow through on the details of their metaphors, mix metaphors, or use metaphors that do not fit their data. For example, a writer will begin by comparing a target process to a balancing act and then fail to follow through on the details of this metaphor in writing the rest of the findings. Or, the writer abruptly switches to a totally unrelated metaphor in rendering the same target process (e.g., the process first described in terms of a balancing act is subsequently described in terms of running an obstacle course).

The idea of the balancing act conjures up images of an entertainment or sports performance, as when circus performers walk a tightrope or gymnasts perform on the balance beam. There is the activity of balancing and the result of this activity—namely, balance, or being balanced—as these persons must shift their weight and otherwise try to stay on the tightrope or beam while walking or performing acrobatic feats. Balancing here connotes dealing with, or overcoming, mass, distribution of force, and gravity; it also connotes a precarious, and even spectacular, activity. People love to watch these performers, their pleasure deriving, in part, from the potential for danger. At any moment, the gymnast or tightrope walker could fall. These performers, in turn, like to take the risks associated with their balancing acts. The ultimate risk for the tightrope walker, if she fails in her balancing act, is death. The ultimate risk for the gymnast, if he fails in his balancing act, is injury and/or failure to score well in competition.

Following through on the metaphor of the balancing act (and there is more than can be done here to work this metaphor) means showing how the data collected about a target process can be organized and illuminated by understanding it as a bal-

ancing act. The words writers choose and the word pictures they create should all work toward maintaining the balancing act as the controlling image in their write-ups. Moreover, writers must conscientiously work out the details of the metaphor, not only to determine how to work it seamlessly into their reports, but also to ensure that it really fits their data. I recall, early in the analysis of data from one of my projects, my great attraction to the image of "crossing the Rubicon." I wanted to liken the process I was studying to that mythic feat. After trying to hold on to this metaphor simply because it appealed to me, I finally realized it was a poor choice for my data and let it go. Crossing the Rubicon implies an irrevocable commitment to conquer or perish: Once the river is crossed, there is no going back. Yet, my data clearly showed participants in the process that I was studying going back and forth over the same ground. A description of my data in terms of this metaphor would have been a misrepresentation of those data. Using the metaphor to render the data would have constituted a misuse of the metaphor.

The balancing act is an inherent part of walking a tightrope, traversing a balance beam, and juggling. But, juggling connotes objects maintained in continuous motion in the air. The juggler, the gymnast on the balance beam, and the circus tightrope walker all engage in a balancing act, but the juggler is on the ground, in no danger of falling himself, and he looks up to keep his objects, which are in danger of falling on him, in the air. In contrast, the gymnast and tightrope walker look straight ahead; the gymnast also uses his arms to stay balanced and the tightrope walker uses a long pole. One of the many tasks for writers choosing the balancing act as the controlling image for their findings is to decide whether the process they studied is best rendered as juggling, tightrope walking, or gymnastics on the balance beam. Is the danger in the target process being rendered like the danger of falling from a high wire, or like the danger of having objects in the air falling on the person trying to keep them in the air? Is there a safety net under the high wire? What do jugglers do, in comparison to tightrope walkers, to enact balancing successfully? Is the balancing act in the target process an embodied activity, like it is for the juggler, circus performer, and gymnast? What does balancing in these circumstances mean: equal distribution of weight, simultaneous lift of objects, or harmonious arrangement or proportion?

Asking these questions will generate other questions about the target process itself, which, in turn, will deepen writers' understanding of it, and, thereby, tighten their re-presentation of it. Metaphors are supposed to make things cohere: to link parts into a whole. Aborted metaphors abort the processes of discovery and understanding, and lead to abortive attempts to render coherently a process or experience. Mixed metaphors send mixed messages about the target process or experience. As Becker (1986, p. 86) observed, "using a metaphor is a serious theoretical exercise." Metaphors ought to "attract attention" (p. 86) because they illuminate the work, not because readers are trying to figure out what their message is.

STRATEGIES FOR RE-PRESENTING DATA

Data from qualitative studies may be re-presented using one of several templates or logics that give the write-up structure, coherence, and rhythm. These templates may be used in combination, as findings may be organized by one primary, and one or more secondary, principles that ought to be clearly evident in the multilevel headers dividing the findings into sections. What writers are seeking to avoid is a "no order order" (Chenail, 1995), where no logic exists in the way the data are re-presented. Such renderings usually indicate that the writer has not yet made sense from the data.

Time

Qualitative researchers may use time as a primary or secondary organizing principle for their write-ups. Findings organized according to a temporal logic show, in the write-up itself, the unfolding of a process as it happened in real time, as researchers have constructed it from the data they collected. That is, what is discussed first in the findings is what actually happened first in the lives of the participants, what is discussed second is what happened second, and so on. Writers who want to emphasize causality in a target event may wish to foreground the temporal relationship among events, with special attention to locating trigger events, turning points, and critical milestones.

As shown in Table 1, when time is used as a primary organizing principle in a write-up, the first-level headers indicate time, as when findings about the diagnostic process are organized into "before," "during," and "after" sections. Certain phenomena, such as pregnancy, lend themselves readily to this kind of organization. Smeltzer (1994) used time to group the concerns women

Table 1. Writing Template With Time as the Primary and Secondary Organizing Principles

Time as Primary Principle	Time as Secondary Principle
Before diagnosis	Appraisal
Appraisal	Before diagnosis
Denial	During diagnosis
Acceptance	After diagnosis
During diagnosis	Denial
Appraisal	Before diagnosis
Denial	During diagnosis
Acceptance	After diagnosis
After diagnosis	Acceptance
Appraisal	Before diagnosis
Denial	During diagnosis
Acceptance	After diagnosis

with multiple sclerosis expressed about pregnancy, first discussing their antepartal concerns, then their intrapartal concerns, and, last, their postpartal concerns.

Time also may be used as a secondary organizing principle, as shown in Table 1. The first-level headers indicate key elements or *themes* the researcher has discerned in the diagnostic process as a whole, which are then tracked over time. Smeltzer (1994) could have chosen to organize her findings by the type of concerns women expressed, such as concern for the fetus/infant, and tracked their occurrence, or appearance and disappearance as concerns, over the course of the maternity cycle. Writers must choose which organization of findings render the data in the most illuminating, least complicated, and nonredundant way. Writers should experiment with different organizational schemes for the write-up. The very embodied act of seeing women's pregnancy-related concerns grouped in one data display by time in pregnancy and, in another data display, by type of concern, will likely generate new directions in analysis and make more apparent to the researcher the best way to render these concerns. The organization that appears in the write-up should be the one that best contains the data, and shows what the writer wants the reader to see. In the examples given, does the writer want to emphasize the staging of events in the diagnostic process, or the recurring elements in the process? Does the writer want to emphasize the timing of women's concerns, or the continuity and discontinuity in their concerns?

Researcher time. In contrast to organizing a write-up by how the target phenomenon unfolds over time, researchers may wish to organize their findings according to what they themselves discovered first, second, third, and so on, about the event. The researcher is the temporal reference point here, not the event itself. Chenail (1995) referred to this as the "archaeological style of presentation" where what is "first discovered" by the researcher is presented first, and before material that is "last discovered." Researchers might choose this strategy to insert themselves more centrally into their texts or to showcase the hidden and deeply complicated nature of what, on the surface, first appeared simple.

Time-related rhetorical devices. Researchers, with a penchant for good storytelling and dramatic effect, may consciously use time-related rhetorical devices, such as flashbacks and/or flash-forwards. Writers may use such devices better to situate or explain an event, while still conveying the actual order in which the events took place. Writers can heighten the readers' feeling for the nonlinear and recursive nature of a target process by moving the reader back and forth in time, reprising, through the write-up itself, the forward and backward movement of the research participants' experience of the process. Or, writers can heighten the suspense or mystery of an event by withholding the ending from their readers until the end of the findings. By using such narrative devices, writers convey both information about, and a feeling for, an experience.

For example, a researcher wanting to convey how women decided which remedies to use for menopausal symptoms might first tell the reader what these women chose (e.g., hormonal therapy, vitamin therapy, or exercise regimens) and then move the reader back (or back and forth) in time to show the various ways these women came to their choices. In contrast, the writer may not reveal the choices the women made until after their decision-making styles have been described, because the writer wants to show how several different styles all led to the same choice.

Prevalence

A different way to re-present data is to organize them by central tendencies and ranges. Chenail (1995) referred to this strategy as a "quantitative-informed" mode of re-presentation. Writers choosing this mode would present first the most prevailing or frequently occurring themes in their data and then address deviations from the "mean." This format is especially useful in studies with maximum variation sampling, where the researcher's intention is to show the convergence and divergence of factors in a disparate group of

people experiencing the same event. In the example of the study of pregnant women's concerns, if analysis had shown one overriding and three lesser concerns in these women, the findings might have been arranged using a prevalence, as opposed to a temporal, logic.

Sensitizing Concepts and Coding Families

Researchers whose purpose is to develop or test extant theory may use sensitizing concepts from that theory to organize their findings. Daly (1992) used "resocialization" to organize his findings concerning adoptive parents.

When researchers intend to generate theory, they may organize their data for re-presentation using one of the "coding families" (Swanson, 1986) associated with grounded theory studies. The most common coding family is the conditional matrix constructed around a core variable (the nodal point of any grounded theory re-presentation), or the six C's: causes, contexts, contingencies, consequences, covariances, and conditions. The writer first describes the core variable itself, and then those factors leading to, deriving from, associated with, situated around, or otherwise explaining the operations of that variable. Such representations do not have to include a visual display of these C's, but the written text must be written to show their dynamic relations in the process investigated. The core variable and six C's must be clearly linked to each other. The most common errors in grounded theory re-presentations are visual displays and write-ups that tell no story: Diagrams in which the parts do not cohere, or dictionary-style reports of the findings that show no relations among the concepts described. Lists of words (usually participles) to represent processes and subprocesses and sub-subprocesses do not satisfy the requirement for coherence in qualitative write-ups.

A second coding family that writers can use to re-present data is the typology family. The writer's emphasis is on juxtaposing two or more mutually exclusive categorizations of data, often of behavioral styles. The idea here is to address the same parameters in roughly the same order for each type, and to show them in comparison to each other. The writer deliberately plays each type against the others in a sequence that the reader can expect will be followed in the description of each type. Writers point out to the reader where these types are alike and different, using phrases such as "like type *X*, type *Y* . . ." and "like type *X*, but in contrast to type *Y*, type *Z* . . . ". Usually, nouns or adjectives used in a parallel fashion are used to label the types: for example, *procrastinators* versus *initiators* or the *detached father* versus the *engaged father, not procrastinating men* versus *initiators*, or *detached father* versus *engagers*.

A third mode of re-presenting the findings from grounded theory studies is the use of the strategy coding family. Here the emphasis is on using words that denote action, as when persons are described as sharing, withholding, or concealing information about their illness to maintain control and quality of life. Again, each strategy is presented in a parallel manner, using parallel grammar and word structure. Writers who want to convey strategies should use words that denote strategies. They should not refer to their strategies as *withholders* or *shared information*, as neither of these words refer to strategies, and they are not like each other grammatically. The word *withholders* signals a person characterized by a style of behavior, not a strategy per se. *Shared information* denotes a kind of information, not a strategy. The very act of denoting a finding as a noun, adjective, or verb alters the knowledge conveyed. Form is content. Moreover, mixing these forms inappropriately again sends mixed messages to readers who must figure out whether the writer is talking about behavioral types, activities, or kinds of information. Lack of attention to parallel use of words and parallel order in the presentation of content seriously undermines the coherence of an account, and may reflect a deficiency in writers' own understanding of the experiences they are trying to render.

CONCLUSION

> Words, rather than the events themselves, will be remembered. Were this transformation not a necessity, one could call it presumptuous. (Hilberg, 1996, p. 83)

Writing up the findings of qualitative research entails not only committing an account to paper, but also reaching a point where the writer has made enough sense of data to render them. Qualitative researchers must attend not only to the informational content of their write-ups, but also to their form, as poor form can seriously interfere with readers' comprehension of the findings, or even their desire to read the findings. Reading books on writing and write-ups of qualitative findings, with special attention to how they are written, will assist writers to develop their own style, and to experience for themselves the impact of different styles.

Attending to form is not a frivolous pursuit of nurse researchers: It is essential not only to maintaining the integrity of the qualitative enterprise, but also to the widest dissemination and utilization of qualitative research. There is nothing more wasteful of both researchers' and participants' efforts than having important findings lost in clichéd, overwrought, and disorderly prose. Qualitative texts should be "geared toward change" (Tierney, 1995, p. 380) and the writing that effects it.

REFERENCES

Becker, H.S. (1986). *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blumenfeld-Jones, D.S. (1995). Dance as a mode of research representation. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1,* 391–401.

Chenail, R.J. (1995). Presenting qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report, 2*(3) [On-line serial]. Available World Wide Web:http://www.nova.edu//ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daly, K.J. (1992). Toward a formal theory of interactive resocialization: The case of adoptive parenthood. *Qualitative Sociology, 15,* 395–417.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1–17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eisner, E.W. (1981). On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher, 10,* 5–9.

Funk, S. G., Tornquist, E.M., & Champagne, M.T. (1995). Barriers and facilitators of research utilization. *Nursing Clinics of North America, 30,* 395–407.

Hilberg, R. (1996). *The politics of memory: The journey of a Holocaust historian.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

Hunter, A. (Ed.). (1990). *The rhetoric of social research: Understood and believed.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Knafl, K.A., & Howard, M.J. (1984). Interpreting and reporting qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 7,* 17–24.

Koenig, B.A. (1988). The technological imperative in medical practice: The social creation of a "routine" treatment. In M. Lock & D. Gordon (Eds.), *Biomedicine examined* (pp. 465–496). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Krieger, S. (1983). *The mirror dance: Identity in a women's community.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L.H. (1995). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Martin, E. (1990). Toward an anthropology of immunology: The body as nation state. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 4,* 410–426.

May, K.A. (1980). A typology of detachment/involvement styles adopted during pregnancy by first-time expectant fathers. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 2,* 445–461.

Nisbet, R. (1976). *Sociology as an art form.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Paget, M.A. (1993a). Performing the text. In M.L. DeVault (Ed.), *A complex sorrow: Reflections on cancer and an abbreviated life* (pp. 23–42). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Paget, M.A. (1993b). The work of talk. In M.L. DeVault (Ed.), *A complex sorrow: Reflections on cancer and an abbreviated life* (pp. 43–79). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516–529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roberts, E.V. (1995). *Writing about literature* (8th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sandelowski, M., Harris, B.G., & Holditch-Davis, D. (1989). Mazing: Infertile couples and the quest for a child. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 21,* 220–226.

Smeltzer, S.C. (1994). The concerns of pregnant women with multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Health Research, 4,* 480–502.

Swanson, J.M. (1986). Analyzing data for categories and description. In W.C. Chenitz & J.M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory: Qualitative research in nursing* (pp. 121–132). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Thornton, S.J. (1987). Artistic and scientific qualitative approaches: Influence on aims, conduct, and outcome. *Education and Urban Society, 20,* 25–34.

Tierney, W.G. (1995). (Re)Presentation and voice. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1,* 379–390.

Treichler, P.A. (1990). AIDS, homophobia and biomedical discourse: An epidemic of signification. *Cultural Studies, 1,* 263–305.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolcott, H.F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.