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Questions about feedback for assessed coursework

• If you have questions or clarifications about the feedback, please ask Ruba in the first instance.
• If you think there has been an error in marking then you can ask for it to be re-marked but marks may go up as well as down.
Scientific Paper - Introduction

• Provides information needed to understand rest of the paper
• Has several parts:
  • The setting
  • Literature review
  • Need for more research
  • Purpose of current study
  • Value of current study
  • Contribution to field
Scientific Paper - Introduction

• Purpose of current study
  • Follow-up from gap identified in past research
  • Describes which research questions the study set out to answer
• May also be a separate background section
Scientific Paper - Method

- Describes steps taken in conducting study
  - Materials used at each step
  - Techniques used e.g. qualitative, quantitative, structural equation modelling etc.
- Allows other researchers to replicate your study
  - Validate your results
Scientific Paper - Results

• Describes steps taken in conducting study
  • Materials used at each step
• Presents the findings of your study
  • Includes figures and text
  • Descriptive statistics
  • Relationships between variables
    • Hypotheses supported?
  • Themes identified in qualitative data
• Claim – Evidence vs. Fact – Conclusion
Scientific Paper - Discussion

• Interprets the findings
  • Explains what findings imply
  • Tries to explain or speculate about the results obtained
• Can include conclusions
  • Summary of main findings
  • Recommendations
  • Contribution of research
    • Substantive
    • Methodological
  • Limitations of research
  • Future research
Presentations

• Many possible goals for a presentation
  • To inform
  • To persuade
  • To cover your back
• Typical goal of academic presentation is to encourage the right people to find out more
Formats of presentations

• Powerpoint has become dominant and expected style
  • Nested bullet lists
• Much to criticise
  • Low amount of information per slide
  • No context
  • Hides narrative
• See work by Edward Tufte
Review Of Test Data Indicates Conservatism for Tile Penetration

- The existing SOFI on tile test data used to create Crater was reviewed along with STS-107 Southwest Research data
  - Crater overpredicted penetration of tile coating **significantly**
    - Initial penetration to described by normal velocity
      - Varies with volume/mass of projectile (e.g., 200 ft/sec for 3 cu. in)
    - **Significant** energy is required for the softer SOFI particle to penetrate the relatively hard tile coating
      - Test results do show that it is possible at sufficient mass and velocity
    - Conversely, once tile is penetrated SOFI can cause **significant** damage
      - Minor variations in total energy (above penetration level) can cause **significant** tile damage
- Flight condition is **significantly** outside of test database
  - Volume of ramp is 1920 cu in vs 3 cu in for test
Alternative approaches

- No Powerpoint
  - or just as “decoration”
- Something different
  - e.g. Prezi
- Handouts
  - Potential to be far richer in terms of information content (see Tufte, Cognitive Style of Powerpoint)
- Risk is that focus will be on style rather than content
We will not have a vocal chord left. The vocal chords will be eliminated by a process of evolution, as was the tail of man when he came from the ape.
zoom outside the slide and
give your ideas
space
Assertion-Evidence style

• Begin each body slide with a sentence-assertion headline that is left justified and no more than two lines

• Support the assertion headline with visual evidence (photographs, drawings, graphs, films, or words and equations arranged visually)—avoid bullet lists

• In the body of the slide, use words only when necessary—design your slides so that the audience reads no more than 20 words per minute

Checklist for Assertion–Evidence Slides (College of Engineering, Penn State)
Fragments quickly outpace the blast wave and become the primary hazard to personnel.

Goals of a Literature Review

• Understand the state of the art
  • What is current substantive knowledge?
  • What are the most important questions?
  • What research has been done most recently?
  • Who is doing the research?
  • What are they investigating?

• What is current methodological knowledge?
  • What research methods are being used?
  • What tools and techniques are being used?
  • How are results being analysed?
Why do a Literature Review?

• Help you understand current work in the field
• Can assist with understanding theoretical and practical problem
  • Can assist with hypotheses
• Helps identify your contribution
• Provides a firm foundation for your work
• Increases chances of paper being accepted
  • Stops comments from reviewers such as, “This paper should have considered the work of Smith et al. who performed an experiment very similar to the one described in this paper”
Selecting Sources for Review

• You want to learn about an area
  • Look for textbook
  • If no textbook look for survey paper
    • e.g. ACM surveys, meta-analyses
  • If no survey papers, look into proceedings/authors
• Keeping up to date
  • Look at latest proceedings or papers in area
• Don’t rely on Google/open-access/online papers
  • Be aware that others do
Selecting Sources for Review

- Scientific articles
  - Follow the scientific method
  - Required to provide evidence for claims
  - Peer reviewed
  - Open to scrutiny and verification by readers
- Compare with
  - Commercial documents/reports
    - Beware of vendors’ white papers
  - Newspaper and magazine articles
    - May be exaggerated to sell more newspapers
Selecting Sources for Review

• Need to be selective
  • Search on Google Scholar in title field only (Jan 2014)
    • cryptography – 14,000 hits
    • cryptography “public key” – 7,550 hits
    • cryptography "public key" algorithms – 147 hits
      • If search is anywhere in article – 123,000 hits!
  • Be clear about scope of literature review
    • Driven by your research question
    • However, may need to search outside main field
      • e.g. use of Q methodology in privacy research
      • Using an existing technique in a new field
Selecting Sources for Review

- Google Scholar - http://scholar.google.co.uk/
  - Search by author, year, journal, keyword in contents and title
  - Exact phrase search
  - Number of citations
  - Links to SFX@UCL when connected to UCL network
- UCL’s metalib - http://metalib-a.lib.ucl.ac.uk
  - Search by author, title, year
  - Recommend “Advanced” search
- Difference between searching on/off UCL network
Selecting Sources for Review

- Citeseer
- Links articles to the ones they cite and the ones that cite them
  - https://citeseer.ist.psu.edu
- Researcher’s own page(s)
  - Often have free copies of their papers
  - Try a friendly e-mail 😊
- Conference proceedings
  - WEIS, NSPW, SOUPS, CHI, EuroCrypt etc.
Selecting Sources for Review

- **DBLP**
  - Computer science bibliography
  - Tabulates articles by:
    - Specific author
    - Specific conference or journal
  - http://www.informatik.uni-trier.de/~ley/db/

- **Web pages**
  - Articles in quality newspapers, reports, presentations, TV programmes etc.
  - Use with care!
  - Avoid a bibliographies consisting of mainly URLs
Selecting Sources for Review

- Identify key authors in the field
  - Seminal papers – look for lots of citations
  - Privacy – Nissenbaum, Westin, Acquisti, Cranor, etc.
- Questions to ask yourself
  - How relevant is this to my research?
  - How current is the work?
  - What have I not seen before?
  - Does it seem to be a credible source?
  - Is it well structured and easy to read?
Starting Out

• You will initially feel:
  • Overwhelmed
  • Ignorant
  • Confused
  • As though review will never end
• A methodical approach will assist you to:
  • Select the sources – begin to understand the problem
  • Do active/effective reading
  • Create a well-organised literature review
Starting Out

• The foundation of a good literature review
  • A good research question
• Identify important journals and conferences in your area
• Use an iterative approach
  • Initial research question scopes initial literature search
  • Refine the research question
  • New search with refined research question
  • Repeat as necessary
• The final scope of the review
Different Types of Reading

- Pleasure or general interest
  - e.g. fiction, magazines, blogs
- Functional
  - Aimed at achieving a specific goal
  - e.g. instruction manual, news
- Work
  - Also trying to achieve a goal
  - e.g. reports, news, research papers, contracts

- Don’t confuse them
Active Reading

- Has an objective and expectations
- Selective about the text
  - Selects which text to read
- Selective within the text
  - Only read sections which are important to you
  - Don’t necessarily read text from start to finish
- Critical
  - What is the quality of the source?
  - Critically read the text
Active Reading

- Ensures understanding
  - Re-reads text if necessary
  - Consult other sources
  - Come back to it!
- Probably uses printed version of text
  - Easy to annotate
  - Quickly move through text
  - Easier to cross-reference several documents
Effective Reading

• Work in correct environment
• Set goals for the reading
• Read in short sessions
  • Be realistic!
• Make notes – summarise what is being said
  • Reading off a screen is often not sufficient
  • Use technique you feel comfortable with to organise knowledge
• Allow time to reflect and come back to the text
Managing Your Sources

• Use a bibliographic tool
  • Sometimes provides a plug-in for browsers and word processors
• Zotero bibliography management tool
  • www.zotero.org
  • Recommend standalone version
  • Plug-in for MS Word
  • Access via the web
• 12 minute ISD introduction to Zotero at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/isd/common/resources/snippets/zotero
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