As I was going through this slide in the last module on the active voice, I might have raised a question, for some of you. Whenever I talk about the active voice, I always get students who raise their hands and say, but I've been told that I'm not supposed to use WE or I, I'm not supposed to use personal pronouns in my scientific manuscript. And of course, to use the active voice, you're going to need to use WE or I. So you might be wondering, is it OK for me to use personal pronouns in my scientific manuscript?

I'm here to tell you yes, it is OK to use we and I. If somewhere along the way somebody told you that personal pronouns are not OK, I'm going to try to convince you otherwise. There are several reasons why I think we and I are perfectly fine to use in scientific writing and other formal writing.

The biggest reason is simply that in order to use the active voice, you usually have to write with WE or I, and the active voice is just livelier, it's easier to read. And I want scientists to write in the most clear and engaging way possible to do so, you're probably going to have to use we and I.

I also disagree with people who say that removing personal pronouns from your writing somehow makes it more objective. I think that's a myth. Taking yourself out of the paper doesn't in any way make your science more objective, and I'll talk about this a little bit more on the next slide.

Finally, another really important reason for you to use personal pronouns is that when you put your name as an author on the paper, you are taking public responsibility for its content. So you should actively claim responsibility for the assertions in the text by using we or I.

I've heard people argue that removing personal pronouns somehow lends objectivity to your paper. I think that's just wrong. You and your team designed, conducted and interpreted the experiments to write in a way that implies that the experiments just kind of happened, is misleading. The experiments and analysis did not materialize out of thin air. So maybe removing personal pronouns gives an illusion of being more objective, but it certainly does not make the science more objective.

And interestingly, people have been discussing the active versus passive voice for a long time in science. I found this paper in Science Magazine from 1957, and I found this nice quote. She sums up my point very well. I think she writes, after all, human agents are responsible for designing experiments, and they are present in the laboratory writing awkward phrases to avoid admitting their responsibility, and their presence is an odd way of being objective.

All right, even if you're not convinced by any of the other reasons I've just given you, here is a very practical reason why you should use we And I. Journal editors want you to. Journal editors recognize that the active voice is much easier to read, and they want people to read their journals. So the style guidelines for many journals explicitly tell you to write in the active voice. E.g. the style guidelines from Science Magazine, they say Right there, use active voice when suitable, particularly when necessary for correct syntax. E-G To address this possibility, we constructed they are instructing you to use We, or I other top journals, give similar instructions. And actually it's worthwhile if we click on this link here and look at the style guidelines from Science Magazine. I'll just share a few of these with you. You'll notice that the editors tell you to do a lot of the things that we've been talking about in this course. They tell you to avoid jargon, as we talked about last week. They tell you to use the active voice. They tell you to write concisely use, even though, rather than in spite of the fact that all the same kinds of things we have been talking about. So editors of journals really do want you to write this way.

Finally, I can point you to some great papers that use we And I. Here is a great example. Watson and Cricks celebrated 1953 paper in Nature, where they give the structure of DNA. The very 1st sentence of that paper begins, we wish to suggest a structure for the salt of deoxyribose nucleic acid. The first word in that paper is we. And they use we throughout the paper. We wish to suggest we believe, we wish to put forward. This is a great paper to read if you have a chance I’ve actually given the link here, this is a famous paper, obviously, because the scientific discovery is so important. But not only that, it's a very well written paper. It's in the active voice. It's lively. It's concise. It's easy to understand their take home messages. They made the implications immediately obvious. So the paper itself is really quite remarkable in terms of the writing. If you have time, take a look at it and pay attention to their writing style.

当我浏览最后一个模块中关于主动语音的幻灯片时，我可能会向你们中的一些人提出一个问题。每当我谈论积极的声音时，我总会有学生举手说，但我被告知我不应该使用我们或我，我不应该在科学手稿中使用人称代词。而且，当然，要使用主动语态，你需要使用我们或我。所以你可能想知道，我在科学手稿中使用人称代词可以吗？我在这里告诉你，是的，使用我们和我是可以的。如果一路上有人告诉你人称代词不行，我会努力说服你不这样做。我认为我们和我完全可以用于科学写作和其他正式写作的原因有很多。最大的原因很简单，为了使用主动语态，你通常必须和我们或我一起写作，而且主动语音更生动。它更容易阅读，我希望科学家们以尽可能清晰、最引人入胜的方式写作。要做到这一点，你可能必须使用我们和我，我也不同意那些认为从你的写作中删除人称代词会让它更加客观的人的看法。我认为这是个神话。从论文中脱颖而出丝毫不会让你的科学更加客观。我将在下一张幻灯片中再谈一谈这个问题。最后，你使用人称代词的另一个非常重要的原因是，当你在报纸上写上作者的名字时，你就是在为报纸的内容承担公众责任。因此，你应该使用我们或我来积极声称对文本中的断言负责。我听说有人争辩说，删除人称代词在某种程度上可以使你的论文具有客观性。我认为那是错误的。您和您的团队设计、实施和解释了这些实验。用一种暗示实验刚刚发生的方式写作是误导性的。实验和分析不是凭空实现的。因此，也许删除人称代词会给人一种更客观的错觉，但这肯定不会使科学更加客观。而且，有趣的是，科学界长期以来一直在讨论主动语态与被动语态。我在《科学》杂志上找到了这篇1957年的论文，我找到了这句不错的名言。我想她很好地总结了我的观点。她写道，毕竟，人类代理负责设计实验，它们存在于实验室中。写一些尴尬的短语来避免承认自己的责任和他们的存在是一种奇怪的客观方式。好吧，即使你不相信我刚才给你的任何其他理由，但这是你应该使用weandI的非常实际的理由。期刊编辑希望你这样做。期刊编辑认识到，主动语音更容易阅读。他们希望人们阅读他们的日记。因此，许多期刊的风格指南明确要求你用主动语写作。例如，《科学》杂志的风格指南。他们说，在合适的时候使用主动语态，尤其是在语法正确所需的情况下，例如，为了解决这种可能性，我们构造了。他们指示你使用我们或我。其他顶级期刊也给出了类似的说明。实际上，如果我们点击此处的链接，并查看《科学》杂志的风格指南，这是值得的。我只想和你分享其中的一些。你会注意到，编辑告诉你要做我们在本课程中一直在谈论的很多事情。正如我们上周所说的那样，他们告诉你要避免使用行话。他们告诉你使用主动语态。他们告诉你要写得简洁，尽管如此，还是要使用，而不是尽管如此。我们一直在谈论的都是同样的事情。因此，期刊编辑确实希望你用这种方式写作。最后，我可以向你介绍一些使用我们和我的精彩论文。这是一个很好的例子，沃森和克里克在1953年在《自然》杂志上发表的著名论文，它们给出了DNA的结构。那篇论文的第一句话开始，我们想提出一种脱氧核糖核酸盐的结构。那篇论文中的第一个词是我们。他们在整篇报纸上都使用我们。我们认为，我们希望提出建议。如果你有机会的话，这是一篇很棒的论文。其实我已经在这里给出了链接。这是一篇著名的论文，显然是因为科学发现非常重要。但不仅如此，它还是一篇写得很好的论文。它采用活泼的声音，活泼，简洁。他们带回家的信息很容易理解。他们让其含义立刻显而易见。因此，就写作而言，这篇论文本身确实非常了不起。如果你有时间，可以看看并注意他们的写作风格。