What Is My Analytical Hammer?

Ryan Beavers

University of Oklahoma

September 7, 2025

Introduction

The saying goes: if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. In statistics and data analysis, that hammer is often a preferred method — regression, logistic models, Bayesian inference, or machine learning. These are tools that shape how we see problems and how we imagine solutions. For me, though, the hammer is not just a technique; it is a way of reading the world. My hammer is language — more precisely, natural language processing (NLP) and what I call "Glitch." As I step further into cybersecurity analytics, I've reclaimed that aesthetic in my hacker handle: Gl:tch. It is the conviction that every dataset is a kind of text, every anomaly a misaligned grammar, every system log a story.

This may sound unusual for a statistician or a cybersecurity analyst in training. But my hammer grows out of a life spent between liberal arts and applied statistics, between the humanities and machine learning. I earned my MA in Liberal Arts from Johns Hopkins, where I was trained to analyze texts with care — to notice silences, ruptures, metaphors, and contradictions. Later, in my MS in Applied Statistics, I learned to model uncertainty and predict outcomes. The two worlds never fully separated. When I look at data today, I still hear echoes of literature. I still see gaps and glitches that feel more like poetry than probability. My hammer is this hybrid: an NLP mindset that reads data as language, combined with a glitch aesthetic that finds meaning in breakdowns and noise.

Origins of My Hammer

The hammer took shape long before I had the vocabulary to describe it. In graduate seminars at Johns Hopkins we read texts not only for their literal meaning but also for the structures underneath: repetitions, gaps, shifts in tone. I learned that silence could be as meaningful as speech, and that an author's "glitch" — a slip of language, a contradiction — often revealed the most.

Later, as I moved into statistics, I found myself gravitating toward problems that still looked like texts. A regression model might be a way of "parsing" a sentence into subject and predicate. A probability distribution was like a stanza — rhythm, variation, and expectation. When I began working with machine learning, particularly in cybersecurity settings, this tendency crystallized. Logs looked like stories. Anomalies looked like misplaced words. Even in a flood of Splunk data, I read events like chapters in a novel: failed logins, odd IP addresses, sudden bursts of traffic.

The bridge between my liberal arts training and my statistical education was NLP. It gave me a technical framework for what I had already been doing intuitively — treating data as text.

Tokenization, sentiment analysis, topic modeling: these are just ways of saying that language carries patterns, and those patterns can be studied. What set me apart, perhaps, was that I never saw NLP as only a technical pipeline. To me, it was a way of humanizing data analysis, of staying attuned to the voices behind the numbers.

The word "Glitch" came later, borrowed from digital culture. In art and music, glitch aesthetics embrace noise, distortion, and breakage. In my work, glitch is not just an error but a signpost. A missing value, an outlier, an oddly phrased line of text — these are not inconveniences to be swept away but moments to pause and ask: what story is this telling? As Gl:tch, a handle I sometimes use when breaking into cybersecurity analytics spaces and demo environments, I intentionally position myself at the intersection of creative unreadability and precise technical work.

How This Hammer Shapes My Practice

When I sit with a dataset, my first impulse is not to run regression or test for significance. My first impulse is to listen. I scan the data as if it were a page, looking for rhythm and interruption. In cybersecurity, this might mean reading authentication logs not only for counts of failed logins but for the sequence, the "grammar" of actions. In health statistics, it might mean thinking of survey responses as narratives of lived experience, not just rows of Likert scales.

This hammer serves me well because it keeps me close to the human origins of data. Cabrera and McDougall (2002) emphasize in *Statistical Consulting* that communication is at the heart of statistical practice: listening to clients, understanding their goals, and translating results back in language they can grasp. My hammer aligns with that ethos. If I already see data as language, then I am more likely to frame my findings in words, metaphors, and stories that resonate with clients.

For example, when presenting a descriptive analysis of experimental game data, I might describe the variation in trust not as "standard deviation" but as "different players writing different endings to the same story." When explaining a posterior distribution in a Bayesian model, I might say: "this is the chorus of possibilities, some louder than others, but all part of the same song." These metaphors are not just flourishes; they are my hammer at work — the belief that meaning is made in language.

The Limits of a Single Hammer

Yet I know that relying on this hammer can be dangerous. If everything looks like a text, I risk ignoring the numerical structures that do not speak in words. Not every problem is best understood as narrative. Some problems demand rigorously applied regression models, not metaphor. Some require Bayesian inference, panel analysis, or clustering. If I force NLP or glitch aesthetics onto a problem where they do not belong, I may miss the real signal.

In cybersecurity, this limitation is especially clear. While system logs can be read as stories, attack detection often relies on statistical anomaly detection or supervised classification. To treat

every dataset as text might mean overlooking numeric time series patterns, or failing to see how correlation structures, not sentences, reveal the breach.

Moreover, a hammer can shape bias. If I am predisposed to read everything as language, I may prioritize qualitative interpretation over quantitative accuracy. I may privilege the compelling story over the rigorous test. This can be problematic in a field where lives, privacy, or policy decisions depend on precision.

Expanding the Toolbelt

The challenge, then, is not to abandon my hammer but to expand my toolbelt. Cabrera and McDougall (2002) remind us that good consultants do not impose their favorite methods on every problem; they adapt. For me, adaptation means holding onto glitch/NLP as my lens while learning when to set it aside.

This expansion takes several forms:

- **Bayesian modeling:** Training in JAGS and Stan lets me quantify uncertainty rigorously. Sometimes a posterior distribution communicates more effectively than a metaphor.
- **Regression and classification:** Linear and logistic regression remain workhorses. They are hammers in their own right, and I must reach for them when the question is about prediction and effect size.
- **Machine learning beyond NLP:** Random forests, anomaly detection, and clustering expand my capacity to see structure beyond text. In cybersecurity, these are indispensable.
- **Visualization:** Sometimes the best hammer is not a model but a chart — a bar graph, scatterplot, or heatmap that lets the data speak visually.

Expanding my toolbelt is not about abandoning my identity as a "glitch reader." It is about weaving multiple methods together so I can choose the right tool for the right problem. In this sense, my hammer becomes less a blunt instrument and more a perspective that coexists with other tools.

Reflection on Field and Future

As I move further into cybersecurity and data science, I want to hold onto the humanistic impulse of my hammer. In an industry that can become obsessed with automation and efficiency, remembering that data is language helps keep me grounded. Every system log was written by a human coder, every packet reflects human intention, every breach has human victims. The Gl:tch aesthetic reminds me that anomalies are not just numbers but disruptions in human systems.

At the same time, I am committed to developing fluency across methods. If I only ever see logs as text, I risk missing the subtle signals in time series modeling. If I only ever look for glitches, I might romanticize noise instead of filtering it out. The future of my field requires balance: embracing narrative where it helps, but also stepping into the rigor of statistical tests, the precision of Bayesian inference, and the predictive power of machine learning.

In this way, the hammer is also a compass. It keeps me oriented toward meaning, reminding me why I do the work. But it cannot be the only tool I carry.

References

Cabrera, J., & McDougall, A. (2002). *Statistical consulting*. Springer-Verlag