COMP 516
Research Methods in Computer Science

Dominik Wojtczak

Department of Computer Science
University of Liverpool

COMP 516
Research Methods in Computer Science

Lecture 6: Bibliographies and Referencing (1)

Dominik Wojtczak

Department of Computer Science
University of Liverpool

Announcements

- 9 different free English language classes per week for intl students
  cgi.csc.liv.ac.uk/~dominik/teaching/comp516
- one of the them is just for you (MSc CS students)
    every Monday at 3pm in ELEC-204 (E4), starting next week
- Barclays lectures every Wednesday at 1pm in ALT
- first practical this Friday at 11am in Lab 1, HOLT Building

Announcements

- 9 different free English language classes per week for intl students
  `cgi.csc.liv.ac.uk/~dominik/teaching/comp516`
- one of the them is just for you (MSc CS students)
  every Monday at 3pm in ELEC-204 (E4), starting next week
- Barclays lectures every Wednesday at 1pm in ALT
- first practical this Friday at 11am in Lab 1, HOLT Building

Announcements

- 9 different free English language classes per week for intl students
  `cgi.csc.liv.ac.uk/~dominik/teaching/comp516`
- one of the them is just for you (MSc CS students)
  every Monday at 3pm in ELEC-204 (E4), starting next week
- Barclays lectures every Wednesday at 1pm in ALT
- first practical this Friday at 11am in Lab 1, HOLT Building

Announcements

- 9 different free English language classes per week for intl students
  cgi.csc.liv.ac.uk/~dominik/teaching/comp516
- one of the them is just for you (MSc CS students)
    every Monday at 3pm in ELEC-204 (E4), starting next week
- Barclays lectures every Wednesday at 1pm in ALT
- first practical this Friday at 11am in Lab 1, HOLT Building

Today's Questions

Discuss the following questions:

1. Why do we cite the work of others?

2. What constitutes a good source?

3. What information about a source should be included in a list of references?

Why do we cite the work of others?

1. To acknowledge the work of other writers and researchers

2. To demonstrate the body of knowledge on which our work is based

3. To enable the reader to trace our sources easily and lead her/him on to further information

We do NOT cite to indicate that we have copied text from another source! That's plagiarism!

Why do we cite the work of others?

1. To acknowledge the work of other writers and researchers

2. To demonstrate the body of knowledge on which our work is based

3. To enable the reader to trace our sources easily and lead her/him on to further information

We do NOT cite to indicate that we have copied text from another source! That's plagiarism!

Why do we cite the work of others?

1. To acknowledge the work of other writers and researchers

2. To demonstrate the body of knowledge on which our work is based

3. To enable the reader to trace our sources easily and lead her/him on to further information

We do NOT cite to indicate that we have copied text from another source! That's plagiarism!

References (1)

Why do we cite the work of others?

1. To acknowledge the work of other writers and researchers

2. To demonstrate the body of knowledge on which our work is based

3. To enable the reader to trace our sources easily and lead her/him on to further information

We do NOT cite to indicate that we have copied text from another source! That's plagiarism!

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

Plagiarism

According to the University's definition, plagiarism is:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;

- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

Copying of another's work, then adding a reference to that work, is **NOT** considered an
'appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement'

Verbatim copying is only allowed in the context of proper quotation

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     ⇝ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals → Proceedings → Technical Reports → Web sources)
  3. Accessibility of source
     ⇝ Completely free → Free subscription → Paid
     ⇝ Avoid 'private communication'
  4. Reputation / Quality of source
  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper → secondary paper / translation
  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
  7. Readability of source
     Well written → badly written

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     ⇝ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals → Proceedings → Technical Reports → Web sources)
  3. Accessibility of source
     ⇝ Completely free → Free subscription → Paid
     ⇝ Avoid 'private communication'
  4. Reputation / Quality of source
  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper → secondary paper / translation
  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
  7. Readability of source
     Well written → badly written

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals $\rightarrow$ Proceedings $\rightarrow$ Technical Reports $\rightarrow$ Web sources)
  3. Accessibility of source
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Completely free $\rightarrow$ Free subscription $\rightarrow$ Paid
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Avoid 'private communication'
  4. Reputation / Quality of source
  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper $\rightarrow$ secondary paper / translation
  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
  7. Readability of source
     Well written $\rightarrow$ badly written

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     ↝ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals → Proceedings → Technical Reports → Web sources)
  3. Accessibility of source
     ↝ Completely free → Free subscription → Paid
     ↝ Avoid 'private communication'
  4. Reputation / Quality of source
  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper → secondary paper / translation
  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
  7. Readability of source
     Well written → badly written

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

    1. Precise location
        $\rightsquigarrow$ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
    2. Longevity of source
        (Journals $\rightarrow$ Proceedings $\rightarrow$ Technical Reports $\rightarrow$ Web sources)
    3. Accessibility of source
        $\rightsquigarrow$ Completely free $\rightarrow$ Free subscription $\rightarrow$ Paid
        $\rightsquigarrow$ Avoid 'private communication'
    4. Reputation / Quality of source
    5. 'Originality'
        Original paper $\rightarrow$ secondary paper / translation
    6. 'Language'
        If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
    7. Readability of source
        Well written $\rightarrow$ badly written

References (2)

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     - ⤳ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source
  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals → Proceedings → Technical Reports → Web sources)
  3. Accessibility of source
     - ⤳ Completely free → Free subscription → Paid
     - ⤳ Avoid 'private communication'
  4. Reputation / Quality of source
  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper → secondary paper / translation
  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in
  7. Readability of source
     Well written → badly written

- What constitutes a good source?

  1. Precise location
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Sufficient information must be given for a third person to be able to locate your source

  2. Longevity of source
     (Journals $\rightarrow$ Proceedings $\rightarrow$ Technical Reports $\rightarrow$ Web sources)

  3. Accessibility of source
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Completely free $\rightarrow$ Free subscription $\rightarrow$ Paid
     $\rightsquigarrow$ Avoid 'private communication'

  4. Reputation / Quality of source

  5. 'Originality'
     Original paper $\rightarrow$ secondary paper / translation

  6. 'Language'
     If possible, a source should be in the language you write in

  7. Readability of source
     Well written $\rightarrow$ badly written

Citing / Referencing

Formally recognising, within your text, the sources from which you have obtained information

Citation / Quotation

A passage or words quoted within your text, supported with a reference to its source

Reference

A detailed description of a source from which you have obtained information

List of references

List of all sources which are cited in the body of your work

Bibliography

List of all sources which have been consulted in preparation of your work

Vocabulary

Citing / Referencing
Formally recognising, within your text, the sources from which you have obtained information

Citation / Quotation
A passage or words quoted within your text, supported with a reference to its source

Reference
A detailed description of a source from which you have obtained information

List of references
List of all sources which are cited in the body of your work

Bibliography
List of all sources which have been consulted in preparation of your work

Vocabulary

Citing / Referencing

Formally recognising, within your text, the sources from which you have obtained information

Citation / Quotation

A passage or words quoted within your text, supported with a reference to its source

Reference

A detailed description of a source from which you have obtained information

List of references

List of all sources which are cited in the body of your work

Bibliography

List of all sources which have been consulted in preparation of your work

Vocabulary

Citing / Referencing
> Formally recognising, within your text, the sources from which you have obtained information

Citation / Quotation
> A passage or words quoted within your text, supported with a reference to its source

Reference
> A detailed description of a source from which you have obtained information

List of references
> List of all sources which are cited in the body of your work

Bibliography
> List of all sources which have been consulted in preparation of your work

Vocabulary

Citing / Referencing
: Formally recognising, within your text, the sources from which you have obtained information

Citation / Quotation
: A passage or words quoted within your text, supported with a reference to its source

Reference
: A detailed description of a source from which you have obtained information

List of references
: List of all sources which are cited in the body of your work

Bibliography
: List of all sources which have been consulted in preparation of your work

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources

    Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed

    Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources

  Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed

  Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources

  Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed

  Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources

  Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed

  Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources

    Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed

    Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

Citing: Rules of Thumb (Zobel 2004)

- If you discuss a paper in detail or note some particular contribution it makes, it must be cited

- Claims, statements of fact, discussions of previous work should be supported by references, if not supported by your current work
  But: Do not cite to support common knowledge; do not end every sentence with a reference

- References to your own previous work is allowed if it is relevant to your current work
  But: Gratuitous self-reference is counterproductive

- Attribute work correctly, in particular, when relying on secondary sources
  - Bad: According to Dawson (1981), stable graphs have been shown to be closed
  - Good: According to Kelly (1959; as quoted by Dawson, 1981), stable graphs are closed

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References

- References need to include the following information, with the order and format depending on the chosen style:

  - Author(s) or editor(s) responsible for writing/editing the work cited

  - Title and subtitle of the work

  - Where the work can be obtained or found

  - Year the work was created, presented, and/or published

- What information is required about where the work can be obtained depends on its type

References: Types of Work

Book

- Author(s) or editor(s)
- Title and subtitle
- Edition, if not the first, for example 2nd ed.
- Series and individual volume number (if any)
- Publisher
- (Place of publication)
- Year of publication

Examples:

A. A. Fraenkel, Y. Bar-Hillel, and A. Levy. *Foundations of Set Theory*, 2nd revised edition. Studies in Logic and The Foundations of Mathematics 67. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.

A. Robinson and A. Voronkov, editors. *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*. Elsevier, 2001.

Examples

Bad:
Marco Dorigo and Thomas Stutzle, Ant Colony Optimization.

Examples

Bad:
Marco Dorigo and Thomas Stutzle, Ant Colony Optimization.

Good:
Marco Dorigo and Thomas Stützle. Ant Colony Optimization. Bradford Book, 2004.

Examples

Bad:
JAVA, JAVA, JAVA by Ralph Morelli

Examples

Bad:
JAVA, JAVA, JAVA by Ralph Morelli

Good:
Ralph Morelli. Java, Java, Java: Object-Oriented Problem Solving, 2nd edition. Prentice Hall, 2003.

References: Types of Work

Chapter/section of a book
- Author(s) of the chapter/section
- Title and subtitle of the chapter/section
- Author/editor of collected work
- Title and subtitle of collected work
- Chapter/section referred to
- Page numbers of chapter/section referred to
- Publisher
- (Place of publication)
- Year of publication

Example:

W. Bibel and E. Eder. Methods and calculi for deduction. In C. J. Hogger, D. M. Gabbay and J. A. Robinson, editors, *Handbook of Logic in Artificial Intelligence and Logic Programming, Volume 1*, chapter 3, pages 67–182. Oxford University Press, 1993.

Conference proceedings

- Editor(s) of proceedings
- Name and number of conference
- Location of conference (if appropriate)
- Time of conference
- Title of published work; if different from the name of the conference
- Series and individual volume number (if any)
- Publisher
- Place of publication
- Year of publication

Example:

D. A. Basin and M. Rusinowitch, editors. *Automated Reasoning - Second International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2004, Cork, Ireland, July 4–8, 2004, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3097. Springer, 2004.

Examples

Bad:
Marco Dorigo, Gianni Di Caro, Michael Samples, Ant Algorithms, third
international workshop, Ant 2002, Brussels, Belgium, September
2002, Proceedings.

Examples

Bad:
Marco Dorigo, Gianni Di Caro, Michael Samples, Ant Algorithms, third international workshop, Ant 2002, Brussels, Belgium, September 2002, Proceedings.

Good:
Marco Dorigo, Gianni Di Caro, and Michael Samples, editors. Ant Algorithms: Third International Workshop, ANTS 2002, Brussels, Belgium, September 12–14, 2002, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2463. Springer, 2002.

References: Types of Work

Conference paper
- Author(s) of the paper
- Title and subtitle of the paper
- All information on the conference proceedings plus
- Page numbers of the paper

Example:

Volker Weispfenning. Solving Constraints by Elimination Methods. In D. A. Basin and M. Rusinowitch, editors. *Automated Reasoning - Second International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2004, Cork, Ireland, July 4–8, 2004, Proceedings.* Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3097, p. 336–341. Springer, 2004.

References: Types of Work

Journal article

- Author(s) of the article
- Title and subtitle of the article
- Title of the journal
- Volume and part number
- Page numbers of article
- Date, month or season of the year, if appropriate
- Year of publication

Note: Information on publisher is typically not required

Examples:

R. MacGregor. Inside the LOOM description classifier. *SIGART Bulletin*, 2(3):88–92, 1991.

A. Seager. Energy subsidy plan for home runs out of cash. The Guardian, 21 October 2006, p. 6.

References: Types of Work

Thesis and dissertation

- Author of the work
- Title and subtitle of the work
- Type of work
- Awarding institution including its address
- Year, possibly month, of publication

Examples:

G. Rosu. *Hidden Logic*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California, San Diego, CA, USA, August 2000.

R. A. van der Goot. *Strategies for modal resolution*. Master's thesis, Faculty of Technical Mathematics and Informatics, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands, 1994.

References: Types of Work

Web pages

- Author(s) of the web page(s)
- Title and subtitle
- URL
- Date of last modification, if available
- Date of access

Examples:

The PHP Group. PHP: Hypertext preprocessor.
`http://www.php.net/`. 22 October 2006.

The International DOI Foundation. The Digital Object Identifier
System. `http://www.doi.org/`. 25 July 2006 (accessed 22
October 2006).

Examples

Bad:

`http://www.cut-the-knot.org/blue/Stern.shtml`

Bad:

`http://www.cut-the-knot.org/blue/Stern.shtml`

Good:

Alexander Bogomolny. Stern-Brocot Tree.

`http://www.cut-the-knot.org/blue/Stern.shtml`.

Last modification June 17, 2000. Accessed October 26, 2006.

Conclusions

- why do we cite the work of others
- what constitutes a good source
- what information about a source should be included in a list of references

Conclusions

- why do we cite the work of others
- what constitutes a good source
- what information about a source should be included in a list of references

Conclusions

- why do we cite the work of others
- what constitutes a good source
- what information about a source should be included in a list of references

"I shall never be ashamed of citing a bad author if the line is good."
– Seneca

Conclusions

- why do we cite the work of others
- what constitutes a good source
- what information about a source should be included in a list of references

"I shall never be ashamed of citing a bad author if the line is good."
– Seneca

Conclusions

- why do we cite the work of others
- what constitutes a good source
- what information about a source should be included in a list of references

"I shall never be ashamed of citing a bad author if the line is good."
<div align="right">– Seneca</div>