

1. The target of a scientific paper is that you introduce a benevolent and intelligent reader into a new topic. He follows you if you guide him and if he can accept your logic. Tell him where your arguments come from and how to understand your reasoning.

If your first and second headline are simply «introduction» and «problem» you have already lost him.

2. In consideration of frequent plagiarism and an absurd abuse of sources I introduce from now on the following rule for all papers submitted to me.

*All the text penned by some different writer is to typeset in slanted or italic.*

I will not correct these passages and it turns out to be clear what you contributed – except from combining passages – to the topic.

3. Structuring papers

- (a) Never change the topic of your assignment!
- (b) Guide the reader and please him.
- (c) You cannot use a headline 3.2.1 without 3.2.2.
- (d) Do not use text between subsequent headlines such a section 4 and subsection 4.1. This text is not captured by the table of contents.
- (e) A section *methodology* is only useful if you understand the term. Do not copy some table of contents like a template without reasoning.
- (f) Assignments have sections, not chapters such as books.

4. Substance of scientific papers

- (a) In science there is hardly no space for an opinion. The core of science are if-then-statements.
- (b) Be aware who tells you something! Regulating authorities, for example, are convinced that interventions are needed and useful. Governments know in any case how to overcome financial crises. And companies tell you always that competition is unfair and will ruin them.
- (c) Do not string paragraphs or sentences without reasoning.
- (d) Integrate tables and figures in your text! Why do you really need them?
- (e) Footnotes are no headnotes at the end of a page. Do not hide important information in footnotes. In fact there is hardly any need for footnotes.
- (f) Graphs without correct labels for the axes are worthless.
- (g) You argue in a scientific context. Figures for the elementary school are to be dropped.
- (h) There is no place for exhilarant gimmicks. Omit them.



- (c) You need the current versions of laws, acts, and treaties. The European treaties in particular have been amended, reorganized, and renamed again and again. «Maastricht Treaty» is no official name of any treaty and not unambiguous.
- (d) Avoid to cite translated books. It is particularly not allowed to retranslate books.
- (e) I suggest the internationally applied short form of citation in the text (without given names). Example: As can be found in Samuelson, Nordhaus (1990, pp. 110–112), . . .
- (f) The publisher's name may be slightly abbreviated by omitting *The, Inc., Ltd., Co., Press,* etc.
- (g) If a work contains more than one place of publication, only include the first place listed.
- (h) The citation of books within your text requires almost always a reference to the relevant pages, i.e. *pp. 110–112* in the example above.
- (i) Footnotes consist of complete sentences including a *verb* and a final *period*. Example: Cf. Samuelson, Nordhaus (1990), pp. 110–112. (cf. = confer)
- (j) Place of a footnote sign:
  - Do not use footnotes in headlines.
  - text word<sup>†</sup>. → refers to the last word.
  - text word.<sup>†</sup> → refers to the sentence.
  - In fact there is hardly any need for footnotes.
- (k) Abbreviations
  - p. 512 = page 512
  - pp. 512–515 = pages from 512 to 515
  - p. 512f. = page 512 and the following page
  - p. 512ff. = page 512 and the following pages
  - s.v. = *sub verbo* (under the word) indicates an article without author in a dictionary

## 9. Scientific sources, especially Internet sources

- (a) You have to explicate your and others' contributions to the paper.
- (b) Cite only serious and reliable sources. Sources such as [www.the-hottest-information.org](http://www.the-hottest-information.org) are useless.
- (c) Articles on Wikipedia are out of control. They change too fast and lack scientific reputation. Do not cite them!
- (d) Forget all Internet sources which cannot be proved after a short time.
- (e) A reference of the form [www.eurostat.org](http://www.eurostat.org) is absolutely insufficient.
- (f) Reliable data on national accounting or something like that is not published by [www.tagesschau.de](http://www.tagesschau.de).
- (g) Many things are available online, but in many cases there is no need to note this. For example, the annual report of the European Central Bank can be cited in the form ECB (2010, p. 123), while in the bibliography we find ECB (2010), European Central Bank (ed.), Annual Report 2010, Frankfurt am Main (probably followed by: available online at [www.ecb.europa.eu](http://www.ecb.europa.eu).)
- (h) Rule of thumb: no author or editor, no reliable source, no citation

## 10. My own abbreviations

A – argument (missing logic)

f – false, wrong

i.s. – incompetent source (dubious, bad, subordinate, non-scientific . . . source)

P = phrase (you cannot say it this way)

S = (bad) structure of a sentence

s.a. = see above

T = tense (e.g., if you mix past and present)

wc – wrong citation

? – the reader does not understand

?? – the reader does not understand and wonders

??? – the reader does not understand, wonders, and is upset

∞ – deletur, i.e. to be deleted

text.  text – insert new paragraph.

[ text – insert text at the marked position

↓ – correction for the whole text needed, no further notes.

⚡ – contradiction