

# Reading research articles

Read, Reflect, Consolidate.

This is a strategy to read and understand jargon heavy science and social science research articles.



## Additional reflection questions

- ★ How is the article relevant to course discussions?
- ★ How does it inform my own research?
- ★ What are my main takeaways?

### Title

**Read:** to understand broadly what the article is about.

**Reflect:** What do I expect this article to be about?

### Abstract

**Read:** to survey the contents of the article.

**Reflect:** Do I want to read the entire article, based on what I have learned in the abstract?

### Introduction and literature review

**Read:** to understand the goals of this study and what previous research exists.

**Reflect:** What was the gap in knowledge that the authors are trying to fill?

### Discussion and conclusion

**Read:** to understand what conclusions were drawn from the results.

**Reflect:** What question are the authors trying to answer? Did you come to the same conclusions as the authors came to? What future research could be done?

### Methods

**Read:** to understand what the study is testing, and to assess the quality of the study.

**Reflect:** Are these methods valid, reproducible and reliable? Are the methods aligned with other methods for the current standard in the field? Who were the participants? What was the sample size? What is the theoretical foundation?

### Results

**Read:** to understand what the results are portraying, how the data is being analyzed and interpreted.

**Reflect:** What are the main findings? What conclusions can I draw?

## Consolidate

Create a summary sheet of your readings with a few sentence about each of the sections. Doing this for multiple readings will also allow you to find trends, patterns, or various arguments in research.

These references can aid in constructing a literature review and will also help you to identify gaps in the literature that you may want to close with your own project.

For example: Prince et al. demonstrated x but were not able to explain y, while Sam et al demonstrated evidence for both x and y.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License. Teaching and Learning Services (2021), McGill University.

