

Part 1: How to read and select main ideas from journal article excerpts?

Step 1: Analyse the **Title**

- Identify the **Subject Matter** (broad topic)
- Understand the **Context** (specific focus of the paper)
- Predict the **Stance** (based on *word choice* and *connotations*)
 - Support/Endorse**: The author agrees with a specific idea, theory or approach
 - Promote/Advocate**: The author actively argues for adopting a specific policy
 - Reject/Refute**: The author argues against a specific idea or theory
 - Doubt**: The author expresses scepticism/uncertainty about the validity/generalisability of a specific idea or finding
 - Question/Challenge**: The author raises critical points or identifies problems of a specific idea

Article A

Supporting schools to use face recognition systems: A continuance intention perspective of elementary school parents in China	Subject Matter : Face recognition systems Context : Continuance intention perspective, Elementary school parents in China Stance : Support "Supporting"
---	---

Article B

Facial recognition technology in schools: Critical questions and concerns	Subject Matter : Facial recognition technology Context : Schools Stance : Doubt "critical questions", "concerns"
---	--

Step 2: Study the **abstract**

- Relate **Background Information** to the **Subject Matter** and **Context**
- Locate the **Purpose** (*Purpose Statement*) for the **Stance**
- Skip **Methods** (*methodological details*) (for empirical papers)
- Focus on **Key Findings** (for *empirical* papers) or **Key Arguments** (for *theoretical* papers)
- Examine **Implications/Conclusion** to confirm the **Stance**

Article A

<p><i>A great deal of attention has been focused on technological innovation, for example, face recognition, which has been used in some countries in various fields. Nonetheless, there has been little attention paid to parents' acceptance of the use of face recognition systems on campus. To address this gap in the literature, this study examined how different degrees of technological innovativeness and dangerous beliefs in the virtual world (DBVW) influence parents' perceived value of using and intention to continue supporting schools' use of face recognition systems. This study adopted snowball sampling to collect data through questionnaires, and received 380 valid responses from</i></p>	<p>Background Information -Technological innovation -> face recognition (FR) -> various use of FR -> parents' acceptance of FR on campus [Subject Matter + Context]</p> <p>Purpose Statement -Fill a research niche -this article (study) focuses on the relationship between technological innovativeness and DBVW, and parents' perceived value of continuing to support schools' use of FR [Stance: Support]</p>
---	--

<p>parents living in Xuzhou, China. Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling were used to analyse the data, with results indicating that: (1) DBVW was negatively related to perceived value; (2) technological innovativeness was positively related to perceived value; and (3) perceived value was positively related to continuance intention to use face recognition systems. The results suggest that parents support the use of face recognition systems in elementary schools; thus, such systems can be adopted by other elementary schools in other areas.</p>	<p><i>Methodological Details</i></p> <p><i>Key Findings</i></p> <p><i>Implications</i></p> <p>-The author supports the use of FR and promotes it to other schools [Stance: Support]</p>
--	--

Article B

<p>Facial recognition technology is now being introduced across various aspects of public life. This includes the burgeoning integration of facial recognition and facial detection into compulsory schooling to address issues such as campus security, automated registration and student emotion detection. So far, these technologies have largely been seen as routine additions to school systems with already extensive cultures of monitoring and surveillance. While critical commentators are beginning to question the pedagogical limitations of facially driven learning, this article contends that school-based facial recognition presents a number of other social challenges and concerns that merit specific attention. This includes the likelihood of facial recognition technology altering the nature of schools and schooling along divisive, authoritarian and oppressive lines. Against this background, the article considers whether or not a valid case can ever be made for allowing this form of technology in schools.</p>	<p><i>Background Information</i></p> <p>-Public life -> schools -> use of FRT in schools, e.g., monitoring and surveillance [Subject Matter + Context]</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement</i></p> <p>-Contrast other commentators' focus on pedagogical limitations -this article (study) focuses on social challenges and concerns [Stance: Doubt]</p> <p><i>Key Arguments</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>-The author uses "can ever" to introduce scepticism. The word "Ever" may imply that the author sees significant challenges even impossibility in justifying the technology. [Stance: Doubt]</p>
--	---

Step 3: Examine Section Headings

- Connect **Headings** to the paper's **Context** and **Stance** (how they structure the argument)

Article B

<p>Challenging the take-up of facial recognition in schools</p> <p>These questions over diminished notions of pedagogy and consent are important. Yet, at this point, we would like to argue that there are a number of additional issues and concerns that cast further serious doubt upon the implementation of facial recognition technologies in schools. In brief, the following points of contention might be raised:</p>	<p><i>Heading</i></p> <p>-Pedagogy and consent -> additional issues and concerns [Subject Matter + Context]</p> <p>[Stance: Doubt]</p>
--	---

Step 4: Identify and Analyse Topic Sentence (TS) and Concluding Sentence

- Relate **TS** to **Key Findings/Arguments**
- Distinguish between **Authors' Claims** (for the **Stance**, supporting the main arguments) and **Opponents' Claims** (against the **Stance**, counterarguments or critiques)
- Focus on **Explanations** (how **Claims** are logically supported and linked to **Evidence**)
- Determine if each paragraph includes a **concluding sentence** which connects with the **Key Findings/Arguments** presented in the TS. (Note that some paragraphs may include concluding sentences, while some may not.)
- Omit detailed/specific **Evidence/Data** (because examples/data do not speak for the **Stance**)

Article A

<p>Although implicit and explicit attitudes are different, they can both affect behaviours, and individuals' attitude can promote the value perception before performing a behaviour (Kaiser et al., 2021). In line with this, the present study explored parents' DBVW and technological innovativeness in the value perception of the use of face-recognition systems, and continuous intention to use such systems as a research framework. The results indicate that the average score of parents' DBVW is 3.865, which is higher than the average level (3.000), indicating that the parents were worried about the disclosure of students' personal privacy, and generally had a cautious attitude towards new technologies (Perry & Sibley, 2010). The average score of parents' technological innovativeness is 3.796, which is higher than the average level (3.000), indicating that the parent respondents tended to accept new technology (Wang & Lee, 2020). The average score of parents' perceived value is 3.919, which is much higher than the neutral level (3.000), indicating that the parents generally recognise the value of face recognition systems (Kim et al., 2007). The average score of CIU is 3.776, which is higher than the neutral level (3.000), indicating that the respondents generally preferred to continue using the face recognition system at the campus entrance. On the whole, although the parent respondents thought that the face recognition system had certain risks, they were willing to try technological innovation and they thought the system was valuable, so they intended to continue using it.</p> <p><u>According to the results of the path analysis coefficient test, the DBVW was negatively correlated with perceived value, supporting H1(DBVW is negatively related to perceived value), which is consistent with previous studies (Dhaggara et al., 2020). The results of this study indicate that there was a significant negative correlation between users' anxiety about face recognition technology and their perceived usefulness. When users could trust that they had information security on the Internet, they would have lower information leakage anxiety and higher use intention (Singh & Sinha, 2020). Therefore, this study suggests that the higher the parents' DBVW, the lower the value they perceived.</u></p> <p><u>The results of the path analysis coefficient test revealed that technological innovativeness has a positive correlation with perceived value, supporting H2(Technological innovativeness was positively related to perceived value). The results are consistent with previous studies (Albertsen et al., 2020; Lee, 2013), which proved that personal innovation had a positive relationship with perceived usefulness which accounts for the relationship between parents' technological innovativeness and perceived value in this research.</u></p>	<p>Topic Sentence -The author explained the use of value perception to find out parents' continuous intention to use FRT.</p> <p>Data #1 <u>Finding #1</u></p> <p>Data #2 <u>Finding #2</u></p> <p>Data #3 <u>Finding #3</u></p> <p>Data #4 <u>Finding #4</u></p> <p>Author's Claim -Despite risks, the author generally supports the continuous use of FRT [Stance: Support]</p> <p><u>Finding #5</u></p> <p>Author's elaboration on the finding</p> <p>Author's interpretation</p> <p><u>Finding #6</u></p> <p>Author's elaboration on the finding</p>
--	---

This study found that the higher the technological innovativeness, the higher the perceived value.	Author's interpretation
--	-------------------------

Article B

<p><i>The inescapable nature of school-based facial recognition</i></p> <p>Another point of concern is the inescapability of facial monitoring within school contexts. [E1] Unlike other forms of personal data <i>(i.e., any piece of data connected to an individual's name)</i>, facial data lends itself to constant and permanent surveillance. [E2] In short, people are always connected to their faces. Thus, unlike social media posts or interactions with school learning management systems, there is no option for students to self-curate and restrict what data they 'share'. [E3] While students might be able to opt-out from facial detection elements of their school's learning systems <i>(for example, the use of eye-tracking or facial thermal imaging for learning analytics)</i>, there is no right to decline to participate in 'non-cooperative' facial recognition systems <i>(indeed, any opt-out effectively renders campus facial recognition systems ineffective)</i>. [E4] While such coercion applies to the use of facial recognition in all public spaces, it is especially acute in schools. <i>For example, most schools enforce dress codes that preclude students' faces being covered by hair, hoods or other obtrusions. This makes it difficult for students to obscure their faces from surveillance cameras.</i> [E5] This also raises the inadequacy of any promise of 'informed consent' regarding school facial recognition systems. The systems being deployed in schools for security and attendance purposes rely on complete sweeps of classrooms and corridors in order to operate. [E6] This renders 'opt-in' and 'out-out' approaches counter-productive from the point of view of the system provider. Even if opt-out protocols are in place, the system has to scan a student's face before it can recognise that they have opted out.</p>	<p><i>Sub-heading</i></p> <p>Topic Sentence -Echoes <i>Sub-heading</i></p> <p><i>Example</i> Explanation 1: Constant surveillance Explanation 2: No self-curation option Explanation 3: Opt-out limitations <i>Example</i></p> <p>Explanation 4: Coercion in public spaces <i>Example</i> Explanation 5: Inadequately informed consent</p> <p>Explanation 6: Opt-in/opt-out impracticality</p> <p>-All the six explanations address the <i>inescapable nature of FRT in schools</i></p> <p><u>Key Arguments</u> Authoritarian and Oppressive are addressed by E1-E6</p>
--	--

Part 2: How to structure your summary?

First, study the assignment instructions to understand what you need to include. The instruction of the Sample AWQ is:

FRT has been increasingly adopted in different public spaces, including schools. Different views about the adoption of FRT in elementary schools from researchers and other stakeholders have been seen in the research literature and media.

Your task is to summarise, paraphrase and synthesise the main claims or arguments from the TWO excerpts on the adoption of FRT in schools in no more than 300 words.

Paragraph 1: Introduction

Component	What to include?	Expressions/Examples
1. Background (setting the scene)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contextualise your summary by extracting or synthesising the Context (background) from the provided excerpts. • Introduce a discussion framework, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A problem-solution approach • Areas of controversy or debate 	<p><i>"Facial recognition technology (FRT) has rapidly expanded into various sectors, including education, where it is adopted for purposes like campus security."</i></p> <p><i>"However, scholarly opinion remains divided on its adoption in educational settings."</i> [Neutral]</p> <p><i>"However, its adoption in schools remains a contentious issue among scholars."</i> [Controversy]</p> <p><i>"Nevertheless, academic consensus on its implementation in schools has yet to emerge."</i> [Formal and academic]</p>
2. Thesis Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a concise preview of the summary • Highlight common or contrasting Key Findings or Arguments from the excerpts to address the assignment topic. 	<p><i>"This paper examines key arguments for and against FRT in schools, focussing on parental acceptance, while contending that its adoption raises social challenges requiring critical attention."</i></p> <p><i>"The following discussion presents contrastive perspective on school-based FRT, first examining parental support followed by emerging social challenges."</i></p>

Paragraph 2: Body Paragraph

Component	What to include?	Expressions/Examples ⁺
1. Topic Sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce a specific theme (e.g., moral) or main idea of the Key Findings or Arguments shared across <u>both</u> articles. Compare similarities and/or differences between authors' perspectives Synthesis of Arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group similar arguments from different authors under a shared aspect to address the specific theme/main idea Use in-text citations (including <i>secondary citations</i>) to attribute ideas correctly 	<p><i>"The adoption of facial recognition technology (FRT) in schools has sparked significant moral debate, with scholars raising concerns about privacy violations (Author A, 2023), threats to student autonomy (Author B, 2022; Author C, 2017), and systemic biases in algorithmic surveillance (Author D, 2021). However, Author E (2023) challenges these objections, arguing that FRT's potential to enhance students' safety justifies its adoption despite ethical concerns."</i></p> <p>Note: Synthesising is applied to compare similarities and differences between various authors' perspectives.</p>
2. Explanations of Claims or Arguments corresponding to the specific theme/main idea in the Topic Sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When highlighting differences or opposing views among authors, use <i>contrastive connectives</i> (e.g., "Conversely,") or <i>suitable reporting verbs/phrases</i> (e.g., 'This view is challenged by....') Focus on identifying Claims and Explanations but <u>omit</u> detailed Evidence Use in-text citations (including <i>secondary citations</i>) to attribute ideas correctly 	<p><u>Similarities on Concerns</u></p> <p>-Privacy: "Author A argues that FRT violates students' right to obscurity in learning environments because...."</p> <p>-Autonomy: "Author B and Author C highlight the lack of voluntary consent, especially for minors since"</p> <p>(Note: Synthesis occurs in Autonomy.)</p> <p>-Bias: "Author D demonstrates how FRT disproportionately <i>misidentifies marginalised students, exacerbating inequities by....</i>"</p> <p><u>Difference in Challenge</u></p> <p>-Safety: Author E contends that schools implementing FRT have an ethical obligation to prioritise student safety, arguing that the protective benefits of surveillance outweigh potential privacy trade-offs.</p>

⁺ Authors A-E above are for illustrative purposes only. In practice, you must report the actual author's name.

Paragraph 3: Conclusion

Component	What to do?	Expressions/Examples
Recap	Summarise Key Findings or Arguments from the excerpts to address the assignment topic.	<i>"Despite parental acceptance of facial recognition technology in schools, scholars continue to raise significant social concerns about its implementation."</i>