Week 10
Proofreading and editing

Week 10 Overview

- Writing workshop on quotes
- Academic references and plagiarism
- Proofreading, editing, peer-review
- Peer-review process
- Constructive feedback and evaluation
- Peer-editing of first drafts

Reminder

FIRST DRAFTS DUE MAY 17

PEER-EDITING IN CLASS MAY 19! THURSDAY! PLEASE BRING SOMETHING TO GO OVER

Quick warm up discussion

What is the difference between quotes, paraphrases, and summaries?

Remember

- Quotes: a direct statement from another writer or group of writers
- Paraphrases: a restatement of a quotation in different language
- Summaries: a shortened version of a longer set of text that restates the main point of a subject in different language

Writing workshop: Favorite science researcher or innovator

- Write 1-2 paragraphs about your favorite science researcher or innovator
- Be sure to use 1 reference, 1 quotation, and 1 summary of a previous source (book, article, etc.)

We will read these to our groups. When reading them, consider:

1. Does the reader use a reference or quotation?
2. Does the reader include a summary of something?

ACADEMIC REFERENCES

Academic references

- What are academic references?
- What are some reasons why they are used?
- Is it always good to have as many references as possible in an academic paper?
- What are some problems that might be associated with using references?

Academic references

- A standardized way to recognize the work of others
- Using quotes, paraphrases, footnotes, endnotes, bibliographic references, etc.
- **Used to avoid plagiarism**
- Used to reference other studies and demonstrate your knowledge of concepts and a particular subject area
- In-text citations vs bibliographic citations *

1. Is this plagiarism?

Original source

In order to communicate effectively with other people, one must have a reasonably accurate idea of what they do and do not know that is pertinent to the communication. Treating people as though they have knowledge that they do not have can result in miscommunication and perhaps embarrassment.

Nickerson, R. S. (1999). How we know - and sometimes misjudge - what others know: Imputing one's own knowledge to others. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 737-759.

Student's own work

Effective communication depends on a generally accurate knowledge of what the audience knows. If a speaker assumes too much knowledge about the subject, the audience will either misunderstand or be bewildered.

Avoid plagiarism and referencing

- You should add a reference ANY TIME that you use a quote, idea, or concept from another author
- Any time you reference previous research, studies, or theories
- You USUALLY do NOT need these for things that are common knowledge
  - “Global warming is considered to be one of the largest problems facing our society.”
  - “Joe Biden won the US Presidential election in 2020.”
  - “Kimchi and kimbab are commonly eaten Koreans foods.”

References

- References should be provided to show where ideas came from
- Science writing typically uses both in-text and bibliographic citations
  - In-text citations:
    - …. (Capobianco 2014; Jones 2022)
    - … [1] [2]. … [3] [22] [23] … [40-44]
  - Bibliographic:
    - Capobianco, P. 2014. *Book Title Here.* New York: Routledge.
    - Jones, A. 2022. Journal Article Title Here. *Journal Name* 1(1): 1-44.
- Different fields and journals require different types of references and reference styles (MLA, Chicago, Harvard, APA, etc.)
  - Following these guidelines is tedious and annoying, but it is very important
- Some fields (history) don’t use in-text citations
- You should know the conventions of your own field

Video

References activity

- Go to the THREE LEADING journals in your field or research areas
- How do they use references? In-text? Bibliographic? Etc.
- Compare them to papers in other fields

Ethical publication activity

- In these same journals, find the statement on publication ethics and/or plagiarism
- Read it
- What do you think?
- Did you learn anything from this statement?
- Anything that surprised you?

Questions?

Proofreading, editing, and peer-review

Discuss

What are the differences between proofreading, editing, and peer-review?

Differences

Proofreading: Checking for grammatical and spelling errors

Editing: Revising the content of an article more than simple proofreading

Peer-review: The process of submitting an article to a journal, having it be evaluated, and revising based on reviewers’ recommendations

Proofreading

- Checking your paper for spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors
- Checking to make sure that there are no mistakes in formatting (headings, subheadings, etc)
- Make sure formatting is done according to journal standards
- Common ways of proofreading:
  - 1/ checking it yourself
  - 2/ showing it to others
  - 3/ paying a professional service
  - 4/ using a service like Grammarly *

Editing

- Revising the paper beyond spelling and grammar
- Involves revising the content of the paper usually based on certain comments, suggestions, or desired changes
  - Changing the analyses done, which changes the data, which changes the overall result and discussion
  - Doing experiment or running models again
  - Changing the discussion to address problems raised by reviewers
  - Changing the literature review to address certain topics more efficiently
  - Others…

Does anyone have any experience with peer-review?

- If so what was it like

Peer-review

- The entire process of getting your paper submitted to a journal and receiving comments
- 1/ submit a paper to a target journal
  - Identify an appropriate journal
- 2/ receive comments from reviewers, if paper is sent to them
- 3/ revise paper based on these comments
- 4/ start at 2 again
- 5/ …repeat until quality is sufficient
- 6/ published paper :)

Reviewers

- Reviewers will critique your paper according to journal standards
- Is this research unique?
- Does it say something meaningful or make a unique contribution to the field?
- Are the methods solid/robust?
- Is the paper well written? Or is it poorly written and hard to understand?
- How big is the impact of the findings? Big, medium, small?
- Is the literature review conducted well or is it missing important materials?

Submitting your article

- Identify appropriate journals (important but often overlooked)
- Follow the submission guidelines clearly!
- Ensure that graphs, tables, formulas, etc. are in the appropriate places within the paper (body, appendices, etc.)
- Ensure references are in proper format for the journal

Peer-review: Steps 2 and 3: Revising based on comments

- Reviewers will raise some issues with your paper
- Your job is to address these comments through revisions to your paper
  - Minor revisions
  - Major revisions
- In many cases, you should revise based on these comments
- In some cases, if you feel you are absolutely correct or that reviewers' comments were not appropriate, you can challenge the comments
  - Have a negotiation with the editor

Questions?

Feedback and constructive criticism

- Discussion:
- What is constructive criticism? How is it different from criticism?
- Why is it important to show your paper to others for feedback sending it out for peer-review or to your professor?

Constructive criticism

- Criticism that aims to IMPROVE something in some way
- In academic writing, this means receiving CONSTRUCTIVE (useful) comments and feedback that will make your writing and argument stronger
- This is important because you often CANNOT see your own flaws in writing and argumentation
    - Remember Baldwin's Men in Black strategy

Giving constructive criticism

- What are the biggest issues that you faced reading the paper?
- Content: What are the biggest problems with the paper relative to main arguments?
  - Hypotheses and data?
  - Lit review?
  - Discussion?
- Is the writing style clear and appropriate for academic science writing?
- Does the writer have serious grammar, spelling, or stylistic errors that make it difficult to understand?
- Is you feedback to the writer fair?
- Is your feedback respectful?

Receiving constructive criticism (or peer-review comments)

- Identify the biggest themes within the comments
- Organize these from most important to least important
  - Major problem: Literature review is missing important literature and the discussion fails to incorporate this
  - Minor problem: One reference is missing; some spelling errors; a study is misquoted
- Figure out HOW you will address these problems
- Discuss with the critiquer (or journal editor) whether HOW you will address these issues makes sense
- If you feel some of the comments were not justified, respond to the editor accordingly and politeley

Remember

The process of constructive criticism/peer-review is intended to make your paper stronger and make a better scientific argument.

BUT people giving feedback are humans; they are not perfect and all-knowing.

If you feel justified in your claims or that feedback was unfair, you need to justify your claims.

Peer-editing first drafts

Work with a partner

- Send your first draft to your partner, ideally someone within your track
- Read each other's papers and provide comments
- Think about:

1. Can I understand the main idea of the paper (i.e. what the paper is about)?
2. Is it easy to identify what kind of paper it is (lit review, experiment, comparison, etc.)?
3. Does the paper have clear sections and the content within the section is easy to identify (even if I do not know what the paper is about specifically)?
4. Are there major and obvious grammar and spelling errors within the paper?

Review together

Once more: Peer-review comments

Switch your paper with ANOTHER person now.

Do the same thing

Discuss together

Writing workshop

Writing workshop

- Now that you have gotten TWO sets of comments on your draft (maybe three), reflect on the comments given

- What are the MAJOR comments given by your reviewers and the people evaluating your work ?
- What did you learn from this process

- Write a short reflection on these comments and think about what you can do to make the paper better after considering them

HOMEWORK NOTE

- Read “Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles”
- Uses a literary-pedagogy model to identify the structure of academic science articles
- Does this through 'moves' = the trajectory of the paper through the presentation of language
  - more detailed than general structure of introduction, literature review, methods, etc.
- 'steps' = how these moves are carried out
  - step + step + step = move
- the paper identifies common moves and steps in biochemistry papers based on a corpus of articles

WHEN YOU READ

- focus on what is happening in each MOVE and STEP
- look at the language used at how they are executed
- do NOT pay too much attention to the parts of literature on Swales'
- FOCUS on the MOVES and STEPS
- It would also be useful to compare this to one of the articles in your field to see if you can identify them as well

Homework

- Read “Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles”
- Very complicated and detailed, but please read it!
- First draft due May 17