**Conventions in Academic Writing**

There are specific features and conventions that writers should be aware of as they put their ink on paper. These conventions are essential for their work to be clean and precise. This paper requires us to be at pact with these rules and use them in comparing and investigating two academic writings. The article and report to be discussed here are; Starving for Knowledge: Why Campuses Need to Address Student Food Insecurity and Food Insecurity as a Student Issue, respectively. There is a high possibility that some of the conventions used in these two academic works are similar though not all.

Clare Cady is the author of these two articles and a scholar practitioner in high education and stays in Raleigh, North Carolina. She is a Washington State University graduate after which she started her practitioner career at Single Stop, before reinstating at Oregon State University and WabiSabi. Currently, she carries on with her profession at Temple University, College and University Food Bank Alliance. She published both works by herself making them authentic in her own way (Cady, 30).

In my opinion, one claim I could brag on noticing about the conventions in writing is that though two texts may flounder around a similar idea, the context in them are different in terms of style, logic and authenticity. This is because writers have different ideas on the matter hence settling for what would mostly capture the attention of their readers. In Cady’s article, Starving for Food, she mainly glues her focus on food insecurity in universities and colleges and lays down the need for the institutions to address this dilemma. On the other hand, her report on Food Insecurity as a Student Issue generally focusses on the hitch and the effects it has on scholars.

There are five consequent standard ways in which academic scholar need to take into account before writing. These conventions are essential and writers are advised to combine them for their work to be top notch. The first thing that makes an academic work effective is its style and grammar. The grammar is simply how words have been arranged to form sentences and paragraphs. Style mainly involves the two main styles in writing in collaboration with sentence and paragraph structuring. The main styles in writing are narrative, where the work may be formal or informal depending on the writer’s choice. Also, narrative works are entertaining, emotional, imaginative and creative. On the other hand, expositions are mainly informative, scholarly and has certain objectives.

Another important convention is the paper’s conciseness and coherence. Conciseness is using few words in expressing the main point. Coherence in its part, is the quality of systematically and logically arranging material in way that the ideas can easily be followed by readers. Also, a standard work needs to be logic and well-reasoned out. This is to mean that the ideas in the work should reflect the title as well as hold relevant content that could be referred to. Additionally, the work should provide relevant information that is authentic and well researched. Authenticity depends entirely on the writer as creative levels vary. Lastly, bibliography and intertextuality is crucial for a writing to be standard. Writers are advised to provide sources in which they extracted their information. Also, they should cite current sources as information changes as time goes by.

In comparing Cady’s article and report, scholars get to conclude that the thesis do not differ from each other by far. This is because the author generally talks of food insecurity in schools. The only difference here is in terms of the works’ reasoning and authenticity such that in Starving for Food, the focus is entirely on college and university students while in Food Insecurity, the focus is generally on all students including those in elementary schools (Cady, 28). Additionally, the logic and reasoning of the author in these two texts differ. This is evident where she plainly provide arguments as to why high learning institutions should provide food aid to financially unstable students to help them study efficaciously (Cady, 49). The style in this two texts are different as in Starving for Food is more of a narrative while the other one is an exposition. Furthermore, there is conciseness and coherence in how she expresses her thoughts in the texts and this is relevant in a convention writing. Therefore, it is safe to assert that Cady explored all the standard requirements to come up with these texts.

In conclusion, writers should never settle for less when writing academic work. Cady effectively explores the conventions in writing and fill her readers with relevant and well thought out arguments on the issues discussed. Writers are advised to keenly investigate these conventions so as to improve in their work. For instance, biased work can easily be identified by the sources provided or by the style provided in the text. By effectively taking into consideration the five conventions, mere setbacks may be easily avoided and the work receive numerous appraisals from its readers.
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