WORLD

U.S.

Help

AUTOS

The New York Times | International Herald Tribune **11eW** | The Opinion Pages

VIDEO

MOST POPULAR

Search All NYTimes.com ING 🌥 DIRECT Go

Subscribe: Digital / Home Delivery

OPINION ARTS N.Y. / REGION BUSINESS **TECHNOLOGY** SCIENCE HEALTH **SPORTS** STYLE TRAVEL **JOBS** REAL ESTATE Deals on the great Google offers places to eat, shop, and play in your city. Sign up now

GRAY MATTER

The Perils of 'Bite Size' Science



By MARCO BERTAMINI and MARCUS R. MUNAFÒ Published: January 28, 2012

IN recent years, a trend has emerged in the behavioral sciences toward shorter and more rapidly published journal articles. These articles are often only a third the length of a standard paper, often describe only a single study and tend to include smaller data sets. Shorter formats are promoted by many journals, and limits on article length are stringent — in many cases as low as 2,000 words.

This shift is partly a result of the pressure that academics now feel to generate measurable output. According to the cold calculus of "publish or perish," in which success is often gauged by counting citations, three short articles can be preferable to a single longer one.

But some researchers contend that the trend toward short articles is also better for science. Such "bite size" science, they argue,

encourages results to be communicated faster, written more concisely and read by editors' and researchers more easily, leading to a more lively exchange of ideas.

In a 2010 article, the psychologist Nick Haslam demonstrated empirically that, when adjusted for length, short articles are cited more frequently than other articles — that is, page for page, they get more bang for the buck. Professor Haslam concluded that short articles seem "more efficient in generating scientific influence" and suggested that journals might consider adopting short-article formats.

We believe, however, there are a number of serious problems with the short-article format.

Latest in My Network

What's This?

Christian Holley RECOMMENDED Restaurant Review: Next, in Chicago



D.J. Grothe RECOMMENDED

Photography Pioneer Kodak Files for Bankruptcy

Advertise on NYTimes.com



Kellie Ann Christie Coats RECOMMENDED Aldon Smith and Justin Smith Lead 49ers' Defense

POPULAR NOW

Apple's iPad and the Human Costs for Workers in China

Ads by Google

what's this?

Penny Auction Site

Save Up To 90% On A Tablet Device - Win The PDA You Want For Pennies

BidMaxi.com/Auction/Tablets

Epson WorkForce® Pro

World's Fastest 2-sided Printer Explore Epson's new WorkForce Pro.

Epson.com/Workforce

Abercrombie & Kent Travel

Create Unforgettable Memories On An Expert-Led Luxury

Journey With A&K.

RECOMMEND

TWITTER

LINKEDIN

E-MAIL

PRINT

REPRINTS

SHARE

www.AbercrombieKent.com

RIA Brokerage Services

Full Service Brokerage for RIA's - Are You Ready to Be

Independent?

www.TradePMR.com

Blick Art Materials ®

Huge savings when you buy on-line. Outstanding service and

DickBlick.com

Wellbeing Book

The 5 Essential Elements to improve your wellbeing. Assess

vours NOW

www.wbfinder.com

Advertise on NYTimes.com

Global Update



Sign up for a summary of the day's top stories from around the globe, delivered at the start of the European mornina.

glaserr@missouri.edu | Sign Up

Change E-mail Address I Privacy Policy

MOST E-MAILED

RECOMMENDED FOR YOU

articles in the past month

ChemProf All Recommendations First, we dispute the importance of Professor Haslam's finding that short articles get more bang for the buck. Suppose that you conduct two studies, each offering evidence for the same conclusion, and you can opt to publish them either as one long article or as two short ones. Suppose that the scientists who will cite your studies will cite them in either format, either the long article or the pair of shorter articles. Based on citations, each of the three articles would have the same impact, but on a per-page measure, the shorter articles would be more "influential." But this would reflect only how we measure impact, not a difference in actual substance or influence.

Second, we challenge the idea that shorter articles are easier and quicker to read. This is true enough if you consider a single article, but assuming that there is a fixed number of studies carried out, shorter articles simply mean *more* articles. And an increase in articles can create more work for editors, reviewers and, perhaps most important, anyone looking to fully research or understand a topic.

Third, we worry that shorter, single-study articles can be poor models of science. Replication is a cornerstone of the scientific method, and in longer papers that present multiple experiments confirming the same result, replication is manifestly on display: this is not always so with short articles. (Indeed the shorter format may discourage replication, since once a study is published its finding loses novelty.) Short articles are also more likely to suffer from "citation amnesia": because an author has less space to discuss previous relevant work, he often doesn't do so, which can give the impression that his own finding is more novel than it actually is.

Finally, as <u>we discuss in detail</u> in this month's issue of the journal Perspectives on Psychological Science, we are troubled by the link between small study size and publication bias. Theoretically, if several small studies on a topic, each with its own small data set, are sent to publishers, the overall published results should be equivalent to the results of a single large study on that topic using a complete data set. But according to several "meta-studies" that have been conducted, this is often not the case: rather than the small studies' converging on the same result as a large study when published, the small studies give a very different result.

The reason is that small studies generate a wide variety of results, and those studies that generate boring results or results contrary to what their authors predicted are either never submitted for publication or rejected. This doesn't mean that the authors or the journal editors are being dishonest; it just means that they look for significant effects and give priority to novelty. Small studies are inherently unreliable — larger studies or, better still, multiple studies on the same topic, are more likely to give definitive, accurate results.

The rise of bite-size science is worrisome. We urge that editors demand more replication of unexpected findings and that the importance that the academic community gives to quantity of citations be balanced with a greater awareness of potential publication bias.

Until then, bite-size science will be hard to swallow.

<u>Marco Bertamini</u> and <u>Marcus R. Munafò</u> are psychologists at the University of Liverpool and the University of Bristol, respectively.

A version of this op-ed appeared in print on January 29, 2012, on page SR12 of the New York edition with the headline: The Perils of 'Bite Size' Science.

E-MAIL

PRINT

REPRINTS

Outrage in Iraq

2. With Focus on Income Inequality, Albany Bill Will Seek \$8.50 Minimum Wage



3. BlackBerry Under Siege in Europe



4. BOOKS OF THE TIMES
Surveying a Global Power Shift



- 5. WORKSTATION
 Building a Bridge to a Lonely Colleague
- 6. The Bookstore's Last Stand



7. STUDIED
A Blog as Therapy for Teenagers



- 8. CHICAGO NEWS COOPERATIVE Homeless Seek Help From New Plan 2.0
- MEDIA DECODER
 For ProPublica, More E-Books



10. IT'S THE ECONOMY
Come On, China, Buy Our Stuff!

PRESENTED BY

Go to Your Recommendations » What's This? | Don't Show



Chanel's Blue-Sky Thinking

ALSO IN GLOBAL FASHION »

A Dream of Couture Elegance -- With Eyeliner Dior Designer: On the Doorstep?

The New Hork Times | International Herald Tribune

ADVERTISEMENTS

IHT Rendezvous VISIT TODAY >



ds by Google

what's this?

Chromebooks have arrived

Less loading. More surfing.

Instant resume & 8 second startup.

google.com/chromebook



Get Free E-mail Alerts on These Topics

Books and Literature

Psychology and Psychologists

Psychological Science

Science and Technology

Ads by Google

what's this?

Rosetta Stone® German

New Year, New You! \$20 A Month For Full Access. Buy Now

www.RosettaStone.com

INSIDE NYTIMES.COM



BOOKS »



The Male Mystique of Henry Miller

SPORTS »



Defying Gravity With Creativity

OPINION »



Anxiety: An Appointment With Dread

WORLD »



Hamas Leader Takes Rare Trip to Jordan

OPINION »



MUSIC »



Wagner's Horsewoman of Apocalypse

Home | World | U.S. | N.Y. / Region | Business | Technology | Science | Health | Sports | Opinion | Arts | Style | Travel | Jobs | Real Estate | Autos | Site Map

© 2012 The New York Times Company | Privacy | Your Ad Choices | Terms of Service | Terms of Sale | Corrections | RSS | Help | Contact Us | Work for Us | Advertise