



Reflections on research

Everything you always wanted to know but were afraid to ask....

Prof Enrico Motta Knowledge Media Institute The Open University United Kingdom

Objectives for the day



- To share some of the experience gathered in 30+ years of research
- To reflect collaboratively on some of the issues that typically arise when carrying out PhD research
- To offer some practical advice on how to address typical research challenges epistemological, political, social, etc..
- To have a good discussion!









Part 1: The epistemology of PhD research

How to construct a sound research narrative for your PhD



Components of a PhD: Topic



- What is it?
 - a generic research field where the PhD is situated
- Example
 - Semantic Web \rightarrow Linked Data \rightarrow Educational Linked Data
- Why is it useful?
 - It provides an overall context for the PhD, which is useful to determine the specific research issue to be tackled, to select events to attend, papers to read, colleagues to approach, etc...
 - In sum, it helps you to situate your PhD within an academic community
- What if I don't have it?
 - It depends... is it because you are exploring completely new fields or because you are a bit lost?...
 - No topic → risk increases and PhD may end up being a very lonely activity....missing out on peer interactions, role models, obvious publishing venues, etc...
 - Academic world tends to be rather compartmentalized.....



Components of a PhD: Problem(s) to tackle



- What is it?
 - A specific research issue that has not been yet solved and that you attempt to address in your PhD
- Example
 - Detecting new research trends (e.g., the emergence of new research areas) at a very early stage, before these areas have become established (with conferences, workshops, journals, etc...)
- Why is it useful?
 - No problem, no PhD....where I come from, you get a PhD for advancing the state of the art in a particular research area.....
- What if I don't have it?
 - It depends...if you are at the beginning of a PhD, you still have time to select one...Otherwise you are in big trouble....unless you do your PhD in a country where a PhD thesis can simply be a collection of various pieces of work....which, let's face it, is rather boring.....



Defining and grounding a problem





Important: You can traverse this graph any way you want! Just traverse it!

I tend to start from the problem and not worry about the start of the art until it is necessary to do so.....but you can also start from the state of the art



Why are you tackling this particular problem?

The Open University



If you have been able to instantiate the topic/problem/approach framework, you are in very good shape....however

Make sure you know why you are tackling this problem!

Is this really a significant research problem?



Does anybody care about it? Do you care? Does your supervisor care?...

Objectives, Approach, Evaluation







Components of a research narrative



• This is not just sound epistemology, practically it reduces dramatically the risk associated with the PhD.

The Open University



- Don't be obsessed with the 'big idea', just instantiate this schema.
- Once you build this schema, then PhD is just work.

The role of hypotheses



- The PhD on "Early detection and forecasting of research trends" assumes that there are patterns in the way the dynamics of the research landscape evolves and that these patterns can be identified and used to predict the evolution of research
- This is a big, risky assumption
- At the same time, this assumption gives confidence that there is a sound research narrative at the basis of this PhD
- That is, an element of risk is important to provide significance to research, but then of course it is important that the approach is defined in such a way to try and minimise such risk



Components of a research narrative



The Open University



PhD Graph

Output







Part 2: Pragmatics of a PhD



Passion and Ambition

- Doing a PhD requires a lot of hard work. It helps if you are passionate
- Tackle problems that you care about
- But also have ambition!



"No one should be astonished if I bring up the noblest examples. Because, since men almost always walk in the paths beaten by others and **carry on their affairs by imitating**..... a prudent man will always choose to take paths beaten by great men and to imitate those who have been especially admirable, in order that if his ability does not reach theirs, at least it may offer some suggestion of it; and he will act like prudent archers, who.......**take an aim much higher than their mark**, not in order to reach with their arrows so great a height, but to be able, with the aid of so high an aim, to attain their purpose"





The value of role models



B.J. Wielinga, W. Van de Velde, and A.T. Schreiber.

The Common KADS framework for knowledge modelling

7th Banff Knowledge Acquisition Workshop (Banff, Canada, 1992)





The CommonKADS Framework for Knowledge Modelling^{*}

Bob Wielinga[†] V

Walter Van de Velde[§] Hans Akkermans[¶]

Guus Schreiber

[†] University of Amsterdam, Social Science Informatics Roetersstraat 15, NL-1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

> § Free University of Brussels, AI Lab Lentestraat 50-54, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

[¶] Netherlands Energy Research Foundation ECN P.O. Box 1, 1755 ZG Petten, The Netherlands

Abstract

In this article we present a framework for modelling reasoning processes in knowledge based systems. The aim of the framework is to integrate different lines of research and in particular, though not exclusively, the KADS approach and the Components of Expertise framework. We are especially concerned with enhanced facilities for domain modelling and with the notion of problem solving method. The resulting modelling framework, called the CommonKADS modelling framework, fits into a comprehensive methodology, called CommonKADS, that intends to cover all aspects of knowledge based applications. In this article we first present a set of principles on which our modelling framework in founded. We then describe the modelling framework itself, illustrating it with an example.

1 Introduction

There is little doubt about what expert systems do: they solve problems. However, what problem solving is, how we should describe it and whether there exists any systematicity in expert problem solving are questions that are still very much open. Finding the answers

This paper reflects the opinions of the authors and not necessarily those of the the consortium.

[&]quot;The research reported here was carried out in the course of the KADS-II project. This project is partially funded by the ESPRIT Programme of the Commission of the European Communities as project number 5248. The partners in this project are Cap Gemini Innovation (F), Cap Gemini Logic (S), Netherlands Energy Research Foundation ECN (NL), ENTEL SA (ESP), IBM France (F), Lloyd's Register (UK), Swedisch Institute of Computer Science (S), Siemens AG (D), Touche Ross MC (UK), University of Amsterdam (NL) and Free University of Brussels (B).

Enrico Motta

Reusable Components for Knowledge Modelling

IOS Press 1998



in Artificial Intelligence and Applications

Frontiers

REUSABLE COMPONENTS FOR KNOWLEDGE MODELLING

Case Studies in Parametric Design Problem Solving

E. Motta

109



Self-belief is also crucial...





Earlier I emphasised the importance of being grounded in a research community, identify a problem and ground it in the state of the art.....This is all very important but.....

- Do not spend your time worrying about what other people are doing!
- It is normal that you may not be the only one working on a particular issue. Do not ignore the literature but do not feel that you have to change trajectory because other people may get results before you. Each PhD is different!





Exploring Scholarly Data







Exploring scholarly data: a variety of options....



Lack of a semantic treatment of research topics



- Current tools do not treat research topics as 'first class citizens'.
 - E.g., a tool may support a keyword search for papers on Ontology Matching, but by and large tools do not 'understand' that Ontology Matching is actually a research area

- Crucially, understanding what is a research area also means understanding what is <u>not</u> a research area
 - E.g., "case study" is often used as a tag for papers, but it is not actually a research area





Relations between research areas



ACM and other similar classifications



- XII. Intelligent Web Services and Semantic Web
 - I. Intelligent Web service languages
 - II. Internet reasoning services
 - III. Ontology design
 - IV. Ontology languages
- The relations between entries are unclear
 - They are meant to be sub-areas, but for many of them it can be argued that they are not really sub-areas
- The different types of relationships are not distinguished
- Rather shallow
 - Most areas we know about are not listed e.g., only 4 topics are classified under Semantic Web
- Static, manually defined, hence they get obsolete very quickly



Klink



Semantic Relationships

- Reload Ontology Integration relationships
- Problem Solving +
 - bG Domain Knowledge +
 - cT Ontology +
 - bG Ontology Mapping
 - bG Ontology Integration
 - bG {Ontology Matching, Ontology Alignment}
 - cT Ontology Integration
 - CT Knowledge Base +
 - BG Knowledge Representation +
 - CT Knowledge Acquisition +
 - bG Domain Knowledge +
 - CT Expert System +
 - CT Knowledge Acquisition +
 - CT Artificial Intelligence +
 - bG Knowledge Representation +
 - CT Domain Knowledge +
 - CT Expert System +
- World Wide Web +
 - CT Semantic Web +
 - BG Semantic Interoperability +
 - CT Ontology Mapping +
 - CT Ontology +
 - bG Ontology Mapping +
 - bG {Ontology Matching, Ontology Alignment} +
- Natural Language +
 - CT Knowledge Representation +



From a corpus of **15M papers** accessed through the MAS API **Klink** identified about **1500 research topics** and structured them by means of almost **3000 semantic relationships**

F-Measure = 91%

Klink Evaluation





Exploring Scholarly Data





World Wide Web +

Managing Supervisors



- The relationship with your supervisor is very important, so ideally all the following axioms ought to be satisfied:
 - You have a good relationship with your supervisor
 - You and your supervisor share the same goals for the PhD
 - You and your supervisor agree on the approach you are following
 - Your supervisor is there when you need him/her
 - Your supervisor understands the area of your PhD well and provides excellent guidance
 - Your supervisor allows you to concentrate on your PhD and does not interrupt your research with all sorts of other tasks
 - You have regular meetings with your supervisor
 - Etc....





Summing up.....



- Be part of an academic community create connections
- Tackle a problem that is research significant
- Define a sound research narrative
- Make explicit the hypotheses associated with your approach
- Do not worry about competition but keep an eye on them
- Get guidance and support from supervisor, peers and other mentors









Knowledge Media Institute