

# Study Guide

Research Methods in Strategic Urban and Regional Planning, 7.5  
credits, Spring 2024 (weeks 19–23)

Strategic Urban and Regional Planning Master's Programme

Course coordinator: Marko Marila, Hanne Cox

Examiner: Marko Marila

Administrator: Susanne Eriksson

Version 2024-04-19

## Introduction

Welcome to the Research Methods in Strategic Urban and Regional Planning, 7.5 credits. This is the last course of your first year in the Strategic Urban and Regional Planning, Master's Programme.

The purpose of this course is to help you write a potential research design for your Research Master thesis. In your previous studies you have already been trained in different methods and techniques of data collection. This course will guide you to put that knowledge into the context of your research and to reflect on the consequences of choosing one method over the other. At the end of this course, you should be able to comfortably justify and argue for your methodological choices.

## Content (Course Syllabus, DNR LIU-2020-00895)

The course introduces research methods and design of research projects relevant to strategic urban and regional planning. The course discusses central qualitative and quantitative methods used in the field and how these methods are designed, developed, presented and implemented in research and practice. In the course, scientific texts and the scientific discourse are studied and problematised by reviewing scientific publications and research reports in strategic urban and regional planning. Research ethics and good research practices are addressed and discussed. The course also covers the research process, how a scientific paper is written and how research results are presented.

## Learning objectives (Course Syllabus, DNR LIU-2020-00895)

On completion of the course, the student should be able to:

- describe research methods in urban and regional planning;
- evaluate and critically discuss the advantages and limitations of scientific methods;
- appraise and critically reflect on ethical approaches in relation to different research methods in urban and regional planning;
- manage and analyse empirical material according to scientifically accepted methods of analysis; and
- formulate research questions and develop a research design related to strategic urban and regional planning, its methods and theories.

## Teachers

Marko Marila, [marko.marila@liu.se](mailto:marko.marila@liu.se) (Coordinator, teacher, and examiner)

Hanne Cox, [hanne.cox@liu.se](mailto:hanne.cox@liu.se) (Coordinator and teacher)

Graham Minenor-Matheson, [graham.minenor-matheson@liu.se](mailto:graham.minenor-matheson@liu.se) (Teacher)

Sergiu Novac, [sergiu.novac@liu.se](mailto:sergiu.novac@liu.se) (Teacher)

Benjamin Jarvis, [benjamin.jarvis@liu.se](mailto:benjamin.jarvis@liu.se) (Teacher)

## Administrator

Susanne Eriksson, [susanne.eriksson@liu.se](mailto:susanne.eriksson@liu.se)

## Practicalities

The course will be administered through **LISAM** – LiU’s online course management system. This is where you will find all central documents, certain literature and lecture presentations, hand in your assignments and get your grades.

## Teaching

The course is organised around four lectures, five seminars, and three workshops. Homework and independent study are a necessary complement to the course. Language of instruction is English.

The final assignment on which students will be evaluated will be a methodological essay.

### Lectures

The lectures are plenary and will help the students to reflect on the principles guiding method choices.

### Seminars

The students will be assigned to two different groups for the seminars. Each seminar will in principle be divided into two parts. The first part is for students to present their ongoing work and thought process regarding their methodological choices to the rest of the group and receive feedback on their work. In the second part the groups will be divided into smaller sub-groups in which the sub-group members will discuss each other’s submissions and give feedback for improvement.

### Workshops

In addition to lectures and seminars, three workshops will be organised in which the students are expected to (1) prepare a hypothetical interview guide, (2) plan and document an ethnographic encounter with an urban setting or location, and (3) conceptualise a hypothetical artistic intervention in an urban planning context.

## Assignments and compulsory components

### Literature

Lectures, seminars, and workshops all include compulsory literature. The student is expected to read all the literature listed under the heading “Course literature” below. The listed literature corresponds with those mentioned in the context of each lecture, seminar, and workshop, and should be read in advance. Additional literature may be suggested by the teachers. Use of additional literature in the seminar and workshop assignments and the final assignment is encouraged.

## Seminars

Weekly, the students will prepare, submit, and present sections of their methodological essay during the seminars according to instructions. The seminar assignments will be submitted **latest 24 hours before** each seminar (except for the first seminar) on Lisam in the correct group folder in the collaborative workspace. Within each submission you are required to use the obligatory seminar literature and at least one other additional source.

Each student will prepare and deliver a presentation to the rest of the seminar group in all five seminars. The presentations will cover problem statement, methodological choices, research questions, method justification, and analytical strategies. Presentations should be about 2 minutes. All students are expected to read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar. Groups (A and B) will be assigned on Lisam before the first seminar.

## Workshops

The workshops demand participation and preparation beforehand in the form of reading and/or writing tasks. Additionally, Workshop II requires preparatory group fieldwork outside of class hours.

## Final assignment

On **12 June 2024**, after the end of the course, each individual student will submit a full methodological essay on Lisam for evaluation. The methodological essay should be based on the seminar assignments and contain: 1) problem statement and research questions, 2) a short operationalization of the research questions, 3) method choices with an extensive reflection/justification of the method choices, 4) ethical considerations and 5) an outline of the analytical strategies that the data affords. The final assignment should be approx. 3000–3500 words, excluding references.

## Schedule

---

### Lecture 1: Course introduction

*Hanne Cox*

Monday 6 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (TEMCAS)

### Literature

Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning: A Student's Guide*. CHAPTER 1.

Law, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. CHAPTER 1.

---

### Seminar 1: Problem statement and research questions

*Hanne Cox*

*Graham Minenor-Matheson*

Wednesday 8 May 2024 at 08.15–10.00 Group A (KG43)

Wednesday 8 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 Group B (FE245)

### Assignment

Write and submit (no later than 3pm on 7 May) a text on Lisam describing what potential **problem** your research will tackle and specify what the **research questions** that you are going to answer in your thesis might be. Make sure to briefly relate to **relevant disciplinary debates** so that your problem statement and research questions are not disconnected from academic debates and are justified. Within this submission you are required to use the obligatory seminar literature and at least one other additional source. (Approx. 500–750 words)

### Presentation

Each student will briefly (2 minutes) present their research problem to the rest of the group. All students read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar.

### Literature

Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning. A Student's Guide*. CHAPTER 3.

---

## Lecture 2: Metamethodology

*Marko Marila*

Monday 13 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (TEMCAS)

### Literature

Cooke, E.F. 2018. "Peirce on Musement: The Limits of Purpose and the Importance of Noticing." *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy* [Online] X-2.  
<https://journals.openedition.org/ejpap/1370>.

---

## Seminar 2: Operationalizing research questions

*Hanne Cox*

*Graham Minenor-Matheson*

Wednesday 15 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (FE245 & FE243)

### Assignment

Fill in the operationalization table (found on Lisam) and submit it on Lisam (no later than 24 h before the seminar). Come up with at least 3 dimensions per research question and 4 indicators per dimension.

### Presentation

Each student will briefly (2 minutes) present their assignment to the rest of the group. All students read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar.

---

## Workshop I: Hypothetical interview study

*Hanne Cox*

Monday 20 May 2024 at 09.15–16.00 (TEM21)

## Instructions

The aim of this workshop is to try out interviewing with your peers. We want you to try out different questions, discuss with your peers which questions you ask and why, how you ask them and how you structure your interview.

### Before the workshop

Before the start of the course, you will be divided into groups of three on Lisam. In those groups you are expected to find a topic which you will use for this workshop. Make sure to find a topic that every group member can relate to. Next, you will have to prepare your interview questions individually, in preparation of the seminar. Make sure to use the literature for today to help you in formulating good interview questions. It should be a qualitative interview guide, not a quantitative survey.

### On the day of the workshop

In the morning, there will be an introduction to the workshop. After this you will gather in your groups of three to interview each other. One person is the interviewer, one the interviewee, and one an observer. Consider this to be role-play, imagine it to be a real interview. After the first interview you switch roles until everybody has done their interview.

Next, you will discuss in your groups what kind of questions you asked, what worked well, what did not work well, and why. Think also about the structure of the interview, what worked well and what could be improved? Lastly, discuss your peer's attitude as an interviewer, what did you like, what do you think could make the interview better? Use today's literature to reflect.

In the afternoon you will (in the same groups) make a short presentation (approx. 5–7 minutes) about these reflections. Present to the rest of the group what you have done and what you have discussed.

## Literature

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. 2005. 'Structuring the interview' in *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*.

Spradley, J. 1979. 'Asking descriptive questions' in *The Ethnographic Interview*.

---

## Lecture 3: Methodological encounters with lived space

*Sergiu Novac*

Tuesday 21 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (ACAS)

## Literature

Garrett, B.L. 2014. "Worlds Through Glass: Photography and Video as Geographic Method." In *Researching the City*, edited by K. Ward: 135–153. Sage.

Pierce, J. & Lawhon, M. 2015. "Walking as Method: Toward Methodological Forthrightness and Comparability in Urban Geographical Research." *Professional Geographer* 67(4): 655–662.

Swanson, K. 2014. "Urban Ethnographic Research." In *Researching the City*, edited by K. Ward: 54–70. Sage.

---

## Lecture 4: Quantitative methods

*Benjamin Jarvis*

Wednesday 22 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (TEMCAS)

### Literature

- Davis, D.R., Dingel, J.I., Monras J. & Morales E. 2019. "How Segregated Is Urban Consumption?" *Journal of Political Economy* 127(4): 1684–1738.
- Roberto, E. & Korver-Glenn, E. 2021. "The Spatial Structure and Local Experience of Residential Segregation." *Spatial Demography* 9: 277–307.
- Xie, Y. & Zhou, X. 2012. "Modeling Individual-Level Heterogeneity in Racial Residential Segregation." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(29): 11646–11651.

---

## Seminar 3: Method choices and justification of methods

Hanne Cox

Graham Minenor-Matheson

Wednesday 22 May 2024 at 13.15–15.00 (KG43 & FE245)

### Assignment

Write and submit (no later than 24 h before the seminar) a text on Lisam describing what methods you will be using to answer your research questions. Make sure to relate each of the methods you chose to your different research questions, and to describe the method in as much detail as possible. Also argue why the method choices you made are the better suited to answer your research questions, why the type of data this method will produce provides a solid foundation to answer your questions. Highlight what the limitations of the method you chose are. Within this submission you are required to use the obligatory seminar literature and at least one other additional source. (Approx. 500–750 words).

### Presentation

Each student will briefly (2 minutes) present their choice of methodology to the rest of the group. All students read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar.

### Literature

Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning. A Student's Guide*. CHAPTER 7.

---

## Workshop II: Encountering the city (with method)

Sergiu Novac

Tuesday 28 May 2024 at 09.15–16.00 (R23)

### Instructions

One key element of qualitative research of urban environments is the observational method. However, this is not as straightforward as it seems, since for the researcher it usually involves as a first step de-familiarizing the very familiar. The aim of this workshop – based on the theoretical readings of the lecture following up on it – is to practice this first step at 'encountering the city'. This means two things: first, using yourself as a researcher to engage urban phenomena, and second, devising strategies to record these observations on the spot.

In practical terms, the session involves at least one day of preparatory work before the workshop

– the actual ‘fieldwork’ (details below). Students are asked to form groups of 3 (three) and go out into the ‘field’, observing a topic of their choice. This can be a very banal topic, such as the rhythms of a street in the city, the social life of an urban square, practices of leisure in the city, consumption practices in shopping districts etc. The point is to observe patterns, irregularities, details that stand out (those moments of ‘aha, I walked by here a million times, but I never noticed this!’) and to record them. By the lecture from the week before the workshop, students are expected to have formed their groups and have a potential topic in mind. Please send this information to the instructor ([sergiu.novac@liu.se](mailto:sergiu.novac@liu.se)) the latest one day before the lecture. Do not hesitate to contact the instructor in advance if you have questions or want to discuss the potential topic. Please also use the required readings for the workshop rather as examples.

During the workshop the groups will present their findings and we will discuss them together. Please remember that the expectation is to discuss observational practices. You are not expected to have an analytical framing or draw extensive conclusions. Rather, pay attention not only to what you observe, but how, since the presentations will focus on this aspect. Each student is expected to individually keep thorough notes (the so-called fieldwork diary) of their day out in the city. During the workshop, the students will present one or two pictures of pages of the diaries and explain why these were of relevance to them. These can be handwritten notes, drawings, voice memos, pictures, videos, or a combination of these. Finally, during the workshop presentation the group will commonly present their ‘moment of ‘aha’ – or the differing moments/or, even the absence of such moments.

Lastly, try to keep in mind that ‘hanging out’, ‘walking’, ‘chatting’, are not only key elements in the qualitative social sciences, but they can also be fun.

---

## Seminar 4: Ethical considerations

*Hanne Cox*

*Graham Minenor-Matheson*

Wednesday 29 May 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (KG43 & AVOGADRO)

### Assignment

Write and submit a text on Lisam (no later than 24 h before the seminar) in which you reflect on the ethical issues to be considered in your research. It is about the moral decisions you make in your research (design), what you base those on, and the consequences of them. Moral decisions are made in the planning, undertaking, and finishing or communicating of research. Reflect on the moral decision you have made or might encounter and how you will deal with those. Within this submission you are required to use the obligatory seminar literature and at least one other additional source. (Approx. 500–750 words).

### Presentation

Each student will briefly (2 minutes) present their ethical considerations to the rest of the group. All students read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar.

### Literature

Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning. A Student's Guide*. CHAPTER 9.



---

## Seminar 5: Analytical strategies

Hanne Cox

Graham Minenor-Matheson

Monday 3 June 2024 at 10.15–12.00 (KG43 & KG44)

### Assignment

Write and submit (no later than 24 h before the seminar) a text on Lisam where you discuss the possible analytical strategies you will undertake in your thesis based on your method choices and their justification. It is important that this text relates to the first assignment, on the problem statement and the research questions. Within this submission you are required to use the obligatory seminar literature and at least one other additional source. (Approx. 500–750 words).

### Presentation

Each student will briefly (2 minutes) present their analytical strategies to the rest of the group. All students read the submissions made by the other students in the same group before the seminar and prepare to give feedback in the seminar.

### Literature

Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning. A Student's Guide*. CHAPTER 8.

---

## Workshop III: Arts-based methods in urban planning

Marko Marila

Wednesday 5 June 2024 at 09.15–16.00 (TEM21)

### Instructions

In this workshop, you will conceptualise an artistic intervention inspired by the required workshop literature, the workshop introduction, and an urban environment or location of your choosing. The purpose of the workshop is to serve as a speculative exercise; to think creatively about the possibilities of using arts-based methods in the context of urban planning. The methods, materials, and location of the artistic intervention is left to you to decide, but the resulting conceptualisation can, for instance, deal with participating members of the public or include more-than-human collaborators in your hypothetical artistic process. On the other hand, the resulting artwork can simply be an installation that begs the spectator or visitor to think differently about their surroundings.

After the workshop introduction (09.15–10.00), you are expected to work on the conceptualisation of your artwork in pairs or groups of three (these can be formed in advance or on the spot) for most of the day. We encourage you to work outside and become inspired by a concept, location, set of materials, and/or hypothetical collaborator(s).

The resulting conceptualisations of an artwork or an artistic intervention will be presented to the rest of the group at the end of the day (14.15–16.00). Use of photographs, drawings, or inspiring objects and materials is encouraged in the preparation and presentation (5–10 minutes) of your artistic conceptualisation. You will also be asked to reflect on the choice of materials and location of your hypothetical artwork, as well as provide a justification for the methodological and conceptual choices behind your art.

## Literature

- Metzger, J. 2010. "Strange Spaces: A Rationale for Bringing Art and Artists into the Planning Process." *Planning Theory* 10(3): 213–238.
- Wright, S. 2013. *Toward a Lexicon of Usership*. Van Abbemuseum.

## Final Assignment

Submit the final assignment on Lisam no later than **12 June 2024**.

## Course literature

NOTE: All compulsory literature is either available electronically through the LiU library or will be made available for download on Lisam. There is no need to pay for books. Material additional to the obligatory reading may be added to the list by the course coordinators and teachers.

- Cooke, E.F. 2018. "Peirce on Musement: The Limits of Purpose and the Importance of Noticing." *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy* [Online] X-2.  
<https://journals.openedition.org/eipap/1370>.
- Davis, D.R., Dingel, J.I., Monras J. & Morales E. 2019. "How Segregated Is Urban Consumption?" *Journal of Political Economy* 127(4): 1684–1738.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/701680>.
- Farthing, S. 2015. *Research Design in Urban Planning. A Student's Guide*. Sage.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473921375>.
- Garrett, B.L. 2014. "Worlds Through Glass: Photography and Video as Geographic Method." In *Researching the City*, edited by K. Ward: 135–153. Sage.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526401885>.
- Law, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. Chapter 1: "After Method: An Introduction." Routledge.
- Law, J., Rupert, E. & Savage, M. 2011. *The Double Social Life of Methods*. CRESC Working Paper 95. Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC).  
<http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/cresc/workingpapers/wp95.pdf>.
- Metzger, J. 2010. "Strange Spaces: A Rationale for Bringing Art and Artists into the Planning Process." *Planning Theory* 10(3): 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095210389653>.
- Pierce, J. & Lawhon, M. 2015. "Walking as Method: Toward Methodological Forthrightness and Comparability in Urban Geographical Research." *Professional Geographer* 67(4): 655–662.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2015.1059401>.
- Roberto, E. & Korver-Glenn, E. 2021. "The Spatial Structure and Local Experience of Residential Segregation." *Spatial Demography* 9: 277–307.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1202218109>.
- Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Chapter 7: "Structuring the Interview." Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452226651>.
- Spradley, J. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. Pp. 44–53: "Asking Descriptive Questions." Waveland.
- Swanson, K. 2014. "Urban Ethnographic Research." In *Researching the City*, edited by K. Ward: 54–70. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526401885>.
- Wright, S. 2013. *Toward a Lexicon of Usership*. Van Abbemuseum. <https://museumarteutil.net/wp->

[content/uploads/2013/12/Toward-a-lexicon-of-usership.pdf](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1202218109).

Xie, Y. & Zhou, X. 2012. "Modeling Individual-Level Heterogeneity in Racial Residential Segregation." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(29): 11646–11651.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1202218109>.

## Examination

The purpose of the examination is to measure the students' knowledge and skills defined by the intended learning outcomes. These are a prerequisite for continued learning within the programme.

Examination takes place continuously during the course and is based on:

- Active participations in seminars and workshops (pass/fail)
- Final assignment (A–F)

The ECTS grades are A (excellent), B (very good), C (good), D (satisfactory), E (sufficient) and F (fail - considerable further work required).

## Examination Criteria

### **Seminar and workshop participation, pass/fail**

In order to receive a passing grade, the student is expected to 1) attend at least four out of five seminars, 2) present to the rest of the group their weekly assignments, and 3) actively participate in discussions and feedback sessions.

Moreover, the student is expected to attend at least two out of three workshops, perform reading and writing tasks beforehand and actively participate in the workshops by presenting their work and commenting on others'.

Active participation in discussion and feedback sessions is evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Students have read the specified literature beforehand.
- Students have thoughtfully prepared their seminar assignment presentations.
- Students give feedback to their colleagues' presentations.
- Students actively intervene and participate in the smaller group sessions.

A passing grade for seminar and workshop participation is a prerequisite for the evaluation of the final assignment and therefore for the completion of the course.

### **Final assignment, A–F**

Grade	Content related criteria	Goal related criteria	Form related criteria
-------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<p><b>A</b> Excellent</p>	<p>Excellent performance without errors. Detailed and accurate understanding of research methods. Precise explanations of the consequences that methods have for the research design, analysis and ethics.</p>	<p>Precisely accounts for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies they will afford. Clearly states the ethical dilemmas the proposed research will encounter.</p>	<p>The final assignment's purpose is explicitly stated and all the necessary sections are present. The structure of the text is clear, and references are correct.</p>
<p><b>B</b> Very good</p>	<p>Above the average standard but with minor errors. Above average understanding of research methods. Detailed explanations of the consequences that methods have for the research design, analysis and ethics.</p>	<p>Accounts for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies they will afford. Demonstrate awareness of possible ethical dilemmas the proposed research will encounter.</p>	<p>The final assignment's purpose is explicitly stated and all the necessary sections are present. The structure of the text is clear, and references are correct.</p>
<p><b>C</b> Good</p>	<p>The work is generally complete though with some errors. Fair understanding of research methods. Fair explanations of the consequences that methods have for the research design, analysis and ethics.</p>	<p>Demonstrate awareness and attempts accounting for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies they will afford. Demonstrate awareness of possible ethical dilemmas the proposed research will encounter.</p>	<p>The final assignment has a clear purpose and with a satisfying structure. All the necessary sections are present. The text is satisfactorily clear and the referenced are well managed.</p>
<p><b>D</b> Satisfactory</p>	<p>The work is fair but has significant shortcomings. Average understanding of research methods. Explanations or justification for method choices are basic but present.</p>	<p>The accounting for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies they will afford is present but undetailed and imprecise. Mentions of possible ethical dilemmas are not expanded upon.</p>	<p>The final assignment has a purpose and is generally well structured. Some necessary sections might be missing. Text is clear if with some mistakes and the references are well managed.</p>

<p><b>E</b> Sufficient</p>	<p>Performance just meets the minimum criteria. Shows some understanding of research methods. Explanations or justifications for method choices are basic if imprecise.</p>	<p>The accounting for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies they will afford is patchy and imprecise. Mentions of possible ethical dilemmas are not expanded upon and unclear.</p>	<p>The final assignment is done adequately according to instructions for this task. Some necessary sections are missing. Text might lack in clarity and the references are not well managed.</p>
<p><b>F</b> Fail - considerable further work required</p>	<p>Do not show understanding and knowledge of research methods. Explanations or justifications for method choices are absent or incoherent.</p>	<p>The accounting for the relation between research problem, research questions, method choices and the analytical strategies are not acknowledged. Ethical dilemmas are not acknowledged.</p>	<p>Unclear purpose and structure. The final assignment does not meet the minimum criteria. The text is unclear. The references are not correct</p>

## Citation, Review, Plagiarism, and Generative AI

To plagiarize means using somebody else's work and presenting it as your own without referring to the source. It may be a text, idea, theory, image, chart, figure, music, computer program or a product. Even reformulation, paraphrasing, text to your own words, without referencing the source is plagiarism. Plagiarism may also violate Copyright laws. One consequence of plagiarism is a lower level of knowledge of the person plagiarizing. Academia views plagiarism very seriously in a legal sense and teachers are obliged to report plagiarism to the Disciplinary Board (Disciplinnämnden). A conviction in the Disciplinary Board will lead to up to six months of suspension. In the worst case, the person accused of plagiarism will risk being sued for copyright violation by the original author. Staff and students are therefore requested to pay attention to plagiarism at all examinations. At the present course, students are expected to discuss the demarcation between citation, review, and plagiarism in the tutorial groups and check the papers commented on by performing Internet search. If there is any doubt about whether the text is plagiarized, please contact course management before handing in the paper.

Please make sure to read the following information:

<https://liu.se/en/article/plagiering-upphovsratt>

We are living in a complex knowledge society. Part of the University's mission is to teach how to relate to knowledge and the creation of knowledge. AI tools can be used both to search for knowledge and to generate text. When searching for knowledge, the utmost caution is necessary, as the knowledge generated by AI tools is often unreliable. It is therefore important to apply source criticism to AI-generated knowledge. AI tools must not be used to generate texts to be handed in.

## Course Evaluation

Evaluation of the course takes place after the course is completed. On this occasion, students are given the opportunity to give their views on the different parts of the course. The evaluation is carried out in the form of an electronic evaluation, called EVALIUATE, which is accessed through the student portal. The questionnaire is opened one week before the course ends for the students and remains open for the coming three weeks. The students receive email with a link to the questionnaire. Feel free to come up with constructive ideas about what can be improved also during the course.