


Seminar 7

Summaries and critical reviews
Introduction to the project work

Academic writing

Academic writing



Objective



- Based on facts
- Use references
- Even for “common knowledge”

Formal language

- Be specific
- Avoid synonyms
- Avoid redundant words
- Avoid informal language
- Avoid rhetorical questions
- Avoid contractions

Passive voice

Active (informal)	Passive (academic)
I chose this methodology	This methodology was chosen
I researched the topic	The topic was researched
I found it difficult to apply theory to practice	Applying theory to practice was difficult
In this essay I aim to	The aim of this essay is to

Structure

Introduction: Theoretical background
Aim

Methodology
Procedures

Results
Tables and graphs

Discussion regarding
Aim
Weakness
Result

Conclusions

References

- Citations
 - Consistency!
 - Specify the complete reference (page, journal, year...)
 - Bib TeX
 - Use the appropriate:
1. [article entry](#)
 2. [book entry](#)
 3. [booklet entry](#)
 4. [conference entry](#)
 5. [inbook entry](#)
 6. [incollection entry](#)
 7. [inproceedings entry](#)
 8. [manual entry](#)
 9. [mastersthesis entry](#)
 10. [misc entry](#)
 11. [phdthesis entry](#)
 12. [proceedings entry](#)
 13. [techreport entry](#)
 14. [unpublished entry](#)

To think about

in academic writing

ALWAYS!

- Explain concepts before using them
- Even for widely known concepts
- Write full word or phrase (abbreviation), then the abbreviation can be used
- Write full title (acronym), then the acronym can be used

Grammatical tense

- Be consistent
- Use appropriate tense

Referencing vs plagerasing

- Paraphrasing is a **kind** of plagiarism
 - Urkund **IS** smart.. Create sentences yourself!

78%

3

Aktiv



DC-1 detector which trained on a fixed distribution of account-days (80 percent non-fraud, 20

Extern källa: <http://www.acc.ncku.edu.tw/chinese/faculty/shulc...> 78%

DC-1 detector was trained on a fixed distribution of account-days (80% non-fraud, 20%

83%

4

Aktiv



Ezawa and Norton solved the problem of uncollectible debt in telecommunications services

Extern källa: <http://www.acc.ncku.edu.tw/chinese/faculty/shulc...> 83%

Ezawa and Norton (1995, 1996) have addressed the problem of uncollectible debt in telecommunications services.

Equation, formulas and algorithms

- Definitions for **all** notation
- Be consistent

To think about



732A60

Writing summaries

A summary

Is a brief account of the most relevant points
Capture the main messages

- Why?
 - Understand the main points without reading the entire paper
- How?
 - Read carefully and extract the **main message**
 - When writing
 - Do not put in your opinion in the summary text
 - Use your own wording



Main message

- What makes this paper valuable?
- Why would one want to read it?
- Summary is not a short description of **everything** in the paper

Writing summaries

- Keep background information to a minimum
- **Good structure** (step-by-step, approximate equal text proportions):
 - Context
 - Explanation of the main contribution
 - Comparison of the author's approach and the alternative approaches – what does the author write about this?
 - Conclusions, limitations

Preliminary analysis

- Author's central purpose?
- Methods to accomplish purpose?
- Results
 - How was each method used?
 - Are results significant? Or empirical?
 - How do the results contribute to central purpose?
 - How were results interpreted?
- Is research question answered?
- Novelty of the research?
- Does result support other researcher's findings?

What to write about?

Significance and contribution to the field

- How relevant is research question?
- To what extent is the aim achieved?
- Does the text bring much new knowledge?
- How does it match to other works/results in the field?
- What was missing/not stated?

Methodology or approach

- Is methodology clearly explained?
- Are other studies considered?
- How objective/biased is the approach?
 - From previous author's papers?
 - Bayesian/Frequentist, Quantitative/Qualitative
- Are the results valid and reliable?
 - Qualitative? Statistical tests?
- May there be better/alternative approaches?
- Limitations discussed?

Argument and use of evidence

- Is there a clear problem, statement or hypothesis?
- Are the arguments consistent? Do author contradicts to him/herself?
- Are conclusions too strong? Too weak?
- How valid and reliable is the evidence?
 - Data valid?
 - Simulation results sufficient?
- How effective is the evidence in supporting the argument?
 - Do these simulation actually support the claim?
- Are conclusions justified? Do they rely on results?

Critical reviews

Critical reviews

The critical review involves analyzing and evaluating someone's work and presenting a point of view that you can support

- **Types of reviews**
 - Review of a manuscript (opposition of master thesis)
 - Text, formatting and structure issues
 - Methodological issues
 - Review a paper as a part of the own paper
 - Methodological issues
- **Main questions:**
 - What was it written about?
 - How was it written? (style, wording,..)

How to write?

- Main guideline: **constructive criticism**
- **Cautious language**, positive features first:

Ex: Saying what the author should have done but did not

“This was a well-written survey of current information but the connection between nutrient stress, secondary compounds, and herbivory rates in wetland plats *could have received* greater coverage.”

“The discussion include many interesting sections but can be improved and made more relevant if the author use more recent literature to support his views.”

Formatting

- Relevant and interesting title?
- Is the abstract good summary covering the important parts?
- Does the information come into right sections?
- Are tables, graph well presented?
- Connection of text and tables graphs
 - Do they complement or repeat each other?
- Methods well explained?

Point of view

- Is statements presented supported
 - Providing explanations
 - Citing relevant and correct papers

Giving recommendations

- Is needed
- Must be done
- Should be done
- Is recommended
- Is advisable
- Could/might/may be considered

Evaluative language

- unusual
- small
- limited
- restricted
- ambitious
- important
- modest
- flawed
- useful
- careful
- simple
- exploratory
- significant
- competent
- traditional
- remarkable
- innovative
- impressive
- complex
- preliminary
- interesting
- elegant
- small scale
- unsatisfactory

Evaluative language

- All disciplines:
 - Good: useful, important, interesting
 - Poor: difficult
- Humanities:
 - Good: clear, accessible, insightful, original, perceptive, rigorous, complex (sociology)
 - Average: sound
 - Poor: inconsistent, restricted, misleading, thin, anecdotal, simple (sociology)
- Technology:
 - Good: detailed, up-to-date, comprehensive, practical, elegant, economical, simple, efficient
 - Average: accurate
 - Poor: sloppy, complex

References

- “TGTU39 Academic Writing” by J, Takkinen (2010)
- Kuyper, B.J. (1991). Bringing up scientists in the art of critiquing research. Bioscience 41(4), 248-250.
- <https://student.unsw.edu.au/writing-critical-review>

Project work

Topics

- A short paper (**3 pages**) on one of the following topics:
 - Academic writing
 - Writing reviews on scientific papers
 - Constructive criticism in the context of higher education
 - Ethical rules in the context of higher education
 - Academic culture
 - Equal opportunities the context of higher education
 - Literature search, search engines
 - Plagiarism in the context of higher education
 - Data ethics and machine ethics

Required ingredients

- The paper must include:
 - Usual paper elements (title, abstract, introduction, conclusion and discussion, references)
 - Introduction
 - Make a statement in the paper about why this topic is important, mention which problems there might exist in the context of this topic
 - Check the existing literature (scientific papers) on the topic, summarize and present important facts/theories/methods/approaches

Required ingredients

- The paper must include:
 - A critical analysis of the topic by performing some of the following actions:
 - Comparing the problems/methods/approaches you described to the situation/traditions in your own country
 - Providing your own critical judgement about the theories/methods/approaches/guidelines that are present in the literature
 - Interviewing some people about the topic of your paper, summarizing their answers in the paper and making conclusions (construct the interview questions yourself)
 - » Attach survey and answers as appendix!

Instructions Project work

- The paper should be written in Rmarkdown
- The paper should be submitted in **LISAM** at latest on **26th of September, 23:59** in **two** ways:
 1. Under “**Submissions**” only the paper as a PDF-file
 2. Under “**Collaborative Workspace**”
 - Create a folder with your name, for ex. “Anders Andersson”
 - Put your RMD, BIB and PDF files inside
- **30th September** you will receive feedback in LISAM
- Those who Pass first revision will attend workshop 4th of October
- If the paper **did not** reach level required to pass you have the opportunity to submit an **improved version** at latest on **10th of October, 23:59**
- The final grade will be published as either Pass or Fail on **14th October**
- Those who Pass second revision should attend the workshops on 18th or 22nd of October
- Those who Fail have the opportunity to redo the assignment 13th of February 2022

Workshops

- Schedule for groups and opposition is published:
 - Group 1,2: **1st of October** at LISAM, Course Documents
 - Group 3,4,5,6: **15th of October** at LISAM, Course Documents
- You participate at only one seminar of the scheduled four (see opposition schedule)
- Read **all** papers of the participants at your workshop
- Read **one** paper that you are opponent for **very carefully** and prepare at least 5 questions/comments to the author of this paper.
 - These questions/comments should not relate to the grammar or formatting but should rather **be such questions that may raise discussions in the class.**
 - Try to make your questions interesting for other participants
 - You must be able to have enough questions to support discussions regarding this paper for at least 15 minutes.

Criteria for 'pass'

- Attendance of lectures
- **Active participation at the workshop** – not only during the session that you are responsible for
- The paper has a sufficient quality.
 - What is sufficient?

Sufficient quality of the written report:

- The paper is devoted to one of the specified topics.
- The paper has the necessary elements of a scientific paper (title, abstract, introduction etc).
- The problem is clearly presented and its importance is well explained.
- The introductory section summarizes in a clear fashion a reasonable amount of research papers containing theories/methods/facts/approaches related to the topic. Alternatively, at least one research paper is summarized but the student also presents a conducted interview and a connection between the interview results and the conclusions in the selected research paper(s).
- The main section of the student paper, which constitutes approximately half of the text, contains own critical judgements related to the topic, to the conducted interview and/or to the papers related to the topic.
- Grammar and the structure of the sentences in the paper are of a good quality.
- Scientific/academic language
- Correct referencing

Criteria for 'pass'

- Scientific papers need to be analyzed!
 - Blogs, webpages etc. also possible but **only** as support
- Own critical judgements should be clearly seen