

Example 1

The literature suggests that the type of product studied is not always the same, and the definitions themselves focus on different elements, such as environmental impacts (e.g. Albino, Balice & Dangelico, 2009); preliminary production aspects (e.g. Eichner & Pethig, 2006) or life cycle's elements (e.g. Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008). In addition, **there is no consensus on** the terminology used for the concept: **some authors refer to** "green innovations" (e.g. Chen, Lai & Wen, 2006), **while others refer to** "eco-efficiency product" (e.g. Parthasarathy, Hart, Jamro & Miner, 2005; Magerholm, 2003), "environmentally-efficient-product" (e.g. Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008), "environmental innovation" (e.g. Triebswetter & Wackerbauer, 2008; Wagner, 2000) or "green product" (e.g. Chen, 2008; Hartman & Ibanez, 2006). The definitions of "green product" have evolved over time from just "being eco-friendly" or not harmful to the environment (1975 to a better part of the 1990s) to concerns with other dimensions that include manufacturing processes, issues of sustainability, recyclability and waste treatment. **However, although there is yet to be** a universal consensus on the definition of green products, **from an academic standpoint**, there is the general agreement that green products are those that do lesser harm to the environment relative to other products.

(Adapted from UNE thesis, Hassan, 2014, *An Investigation of the Profile of the Green Consumer Segment in Australia and the Factors that Influence Consumers' Purchase Intentions in the Context of Eco-Friendly Fast-Moving Consumer Goods*, pp. 15-18)

The writer in this paragraph summarises the literature on purchasing of eco-friendly products. This is evidenced in the presentation of the facts, e.g. "the literature suggests...", "there is no consensus on..." and "some authors refer to ... while others refer to ...". Critical evaluation of the literature is indicated in different ways. These include reporting verbs such as "suggest", which in this case demonstrates the writer's process of reasoning. Words and phrases such as "from an academic standpoint" and connecting words such as "however" and "although" that counter a proposition also give clues to the writer's critical stance.

Example 2

Regarding analytic methods, **a common strategy, and one advocated in this research**, is spectral acquisition on 'blank' or unpainted rock substrate in addition to pigment (Koenig et al. 2014; Leondorf and Leondorf 2013; Newman and Leondorf 2005; Nuevo et al. 2012; Olivares et al. 2013; Rowe et al. 2011; Velliky 2013; Wesley et al. 2014). In relation to the infinitely thin nature of most rock art and the incorporation of the rock substrate into spectra, **previous work shows that** the idea of simply 'subtracting' the background rock matrix of mineralogical heterogeneous stone **is not feasible** (Olivares et al. 2013; Velliky 2013). **In fact, previous work has not quantified, nor addressed** the impact on their interpretations of, the mineral heterogeneity of rock substrates. **There has also been no prior discussion of** the geochemical signature of weathering processes in rock shelter environments, **nor any attempt to address these**.

(Adapted from UNE thesis, Huntley, 2015, *Messages in paint: An archaeometric analysis of pigment use in Aboriginal Australia focusing on the production of rock art*, p. 27)

As in example 1, the writer integrates summary of the literature with critical analysis. The summary is again evidenced through phrases such as "a common strategy" and "previous work shows that...". Gaps in the literature are also highlighted, as in "previous work has not quantified, nor addressed...", "there has been no prior discussion of..." and "nor any attempt to address these". The writer explicitly aligns the current research with past methods by "advocating" the "common strategy". At the same time, using negative terms such as "is not feasible", "has not quantified, nor addressed" and "nor any attempt", while highlighting gaps, also indicates the writer's analysis of the limitations of previous research on the topic.