

Assignment Guidance and Front Sheet

This front sheet for assignments is designed to contain the brief, the submission instructions, and the actual student submission for any WMG assignment. As a result the sheet is completed by several people over time, and is therefore split up into sections explaining who completes what information and when. Yellow highlighted text indicates examples or further explanation of what is requested, and the highlight and instructions should be removed as you populate 'your' section.

This sheet is only to be used for components of assessment worth more than 3 CATS (e.g. for a 15 credit module, weighted more than 20%; or for a 10 credit module, weighted more than 30%).

To be completed by the student(s) prior to final submission:

Your actual submission should be written at the end of this cover sheet file, or attached with the cover sheet at the front if drafted in a separate file, program or application.

Student ID or IDs for group work	e.g. 1234567
----------------------------------	--------------

To be completed (highlighted parts only) by the programme administration after approval and prior to issuing of the assessment; to be consulted by the student(s) so that you know how and when to submit:

Date set	10/10/22
Submission date (excluding extensions)	24/4/23
Submission guidance	<i>See the separate specification.</i>
Marks return date (excluding extensions)	20 working days from the submission date.
Late submission policy	If work is submitted late, penalties will be applied at the rate of 5 marks per University working day after the due date, up to a maximum of 10 working days late. After this period the mark for the work will be reduced to 0 (which is the maximum penalty). "Late" means after the submission deadline time as well as the date – work submitted after the given time even on the same day is counted as 1 day late.
Resubmission policy	If you fail this assignment or module, please be aware that the University allows students to remedy such failure (within certain limits). Decisions to authorise such resubmissions are made by Exam Boards. Normally these will be issued at specific times of the year, depending on your programme of study. More information can be found from your programme office if you are concerned.

To be completed by the module owner/tutor prior to approval and issuing of the assessment; to be consulted by the student(s) so that you understand the assignment brief, its context within the module, and any specific criteria and advice from the tutor:

Module title & code	WM241-18: Human-Behaviour in Cyber Systems
Module owner	Elzbieta Titis
Module tutor	Elzbieta Titis
Assessment type	CW4: Critical Essay
Weighting of mark	The weighting toward the final module mark is 30%. This assessment contributes to external accreditation.

Assessment brief
<p>CW4: Critical Essay</p> <p>You will be asked to write a critical essay on a given topic. The maximum length should be 1500 words (+/-10%). Tables/figures and references do not count towards this limit.</p> <p>You will be assessed against marking criteria (see specification) based the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehension (showing knowledge & understanding about the subject matter); • Analysis (presenting logical arguments supported by evidence); • Critical Evaluation (questioning relevant arguments by identifying their strengths and weaknesses & considering counterfactual and alternative explanations); • Academic Writing (presenting a clear and structured assignment, use of relevant literature, academic honesty, referencing and citation).

Word count	<i>As in the assessment brief/specification.</i>
Module learning outcomes (numbered)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design, implement, and evaluate an interface for a well-defined community of users to interact with an application to achieve worthwhile user objectives. 2. Analyse the relationship between the human-computer interface, user behaviour, and cyber security consequences.
Learning outcomes assessed in this assessment (numbered)	1 and 2
Marking guidelines	<i>As in the assessment brief/specification.</i> Please also refer to the University Marking Scale below.
Academic guidance resources	Links to resources; support in timetabled lab sessions.

Specification¹

1. Overall context

For the purpose of this coursework, you will write a critical essay on one from the three topics provided (see section 2).

A critical essay is a form of academic writing that analyses, interprets, and/or evaluates a given topic. In a critical essay, an author makes a claim about particular ideas, then supports or disputes that claim with evidence. Therefore, being "critical" means discerning and analytical, not passing criticism or judgement. To learn more, consult the [Library's Practical Guide to Critical Writing](#).

Your essay should be focused on conveying information and making clear points through building an evidence-based argument. A well-thought-out argument is one that considers facts and various opinions, some of which may be opposing to each other, and analyses strengths and weaknesses in each. You should not present only evidence on the position you are supporting. It is more convincing when the information presented is not biased towards a position.

A good essay will be critical and argumentative, interesting and original, focused on the subject, well-structured and clearly presented, and will have minimum of 12 references. The target word count is 1500 words (+/-10%).

The coursework will require submission of assessment by e-submission done via Tabula, which will then go through Turnitin to identify matches in submitted work against other sources. Correct referencing is therefore very important. To quote facts, figures, theories and theorems without accrediting their original source is an academic malpractice as well as [plagiarism](#). To avoiding plagiarism, consult [the Library's course on Avoiding Plagiarism](#).

For detailed information on marking, including criteria, scale and determination of grades, consult sections 3- 4.

2. Coverage

For writing your critical essay, you will be provided with choice of three topics. The topics will be released later in term 2.

3. Marking criteria

You will be marked based on the following components:

- 1. Focus on the question/issue (relevancy):** The first and most important rule in all your written work is that you have answered the question. It is not about how much you know, but all about how you apply your knowledge to the task of answering a specific question. To answer the question effectively you must identify and focus on key points to build a convincing argument to your work.
- 2. Knowledge and understanding of key concepts:** Your work must demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the subject area. *Knowledge* relates to the facts, information and skills you have acquired through your learning. You demonstrate your *understanding* by interpreting the meaning of the facts and information (knowledge). This means that you need to select and include in your work the concepts, techniques, models, theories, etc. appropriate to the task(s) set. You should be able to explain the theories, concepts, etc. meaningfully to show your understanding. Your mark/grade will also depend

¹ ***THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD BE USED ALONGSIDE THE INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES*.**

upon the *extent* to which you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding; ideally each should be complete and detailed, with comprehensive coverage.

3. **Quality of argument (critical analysis, evaluation & reasoning):** You should be able to critically evaluate evidence, arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data. You should devise arguments and make informed judgements to address the question at hand based on current research. Your work must show a logical argument, analytical thinking, evaluation and synthesis. You should not just describe, but convincingly justify your arguments and judgements. There must be evidence that you have reflected upon the ideas of others within the subject area, which is crucial to providing a reasoned and informed debate within your work. Critical evaluation should include questioning relevant arguments by identifying their strengths and weaknesses and considering counterfactual and alternative explanation.
4. **Use and interpretation of evidence (academic sources):** Your work must be informed and supported by scholarly material that is *relevant* to and *focused* on the task(s) set; you should make use of scholarly articles. You should use primary sources (read and cite the original source, and only if original is not available cite source as a secondary article; use secondary citations very sparingly). You should consider the *credibility* of your sources; academic journals are normally highly credible sources (be very careful of internet sources!). It is best to use recently published research articles (i.e., within the last five years, but it is okay to use older works that are seminal/important to the area). It is vital that you paraphrase, i.e., write information in your own words, rather than verbatim from the source. Paraphrasing shows that you have understood the material you have read. You can use any referencing style but you must be consistent; in-text citations are used in the main body of your work and a reference list at the end of your work.
5. **Structure and organisation (coherence & flow):** Your work should demonstrate a thorough and consistent deployment of techniques of academic writing with reference to structure and coherence. There is a logical bridge between words, sentences, and paragraphs. There is clear of connect ideas within each sentence and paragraph, which offers clarity and rigour of structure to the argument.
6. **Presentation (style, referencing, grammar & language):** Your work must provide a thorough and consistent deployment of techniques of academic prose, style, referencing and spelling/grammar.

The six marking criteria above map directly onto the University marking criteria. Guidance on University's marking scale and an explanation of how the six marking criteria translate to grades can be accessed in section 4.

4. Marking scale and determination of grades

You will be marked using the 20-point marking scale, which is a university-wide marking scale that applies to essay-type questions (both coursework and examination). For example, an essay which is deemed to be an upper second-class work may be awarded only the mark of 62 or 65 or 68 within the range 60 to 69, according to whether the work is judged to be of low, medium or high worth, respectively, within the corresponding class. When deriving your composite mark for the module, the 20-point scale is relevant only for the essay element. The final mark will continue to emerge as an aggregation of individual marks, where these individual marks have been obtained in different ways. Note that this means that the aggregate mark itself is not constrained to be one of the 20 marks on the scale.

For clarity on the determination of grades, follow the marking guidance below.

To achieve mark up to 50%, you should demonstrate:

- developing focus and comprehensive engagement with the question, showing evidence of in-depth understanding of the issues;

- developing knowledge and understanding of the subject area; at least some of which is informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline;
- developing critical analysis, evaluation and reasoning skills;
- clear evidence of skills of engagement with literature and associated skills;
- clear evidence of structure and organisation in your work;
- growing proficiency of your chosen style (this includes referencing and formatting).

To achieve mark up to 70%, you should demonstrate:

- a sound focus and comprehensive engagement with the question, showing sound evidence of in-depth understanding of the issues;
- a sound knowledge and understanding of the subject area, which is often informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline;
- developing sound critical analysis, evaluation and reasoning skills;
- evidence of comprehensive engagement with literature and associated skills;
- comprehensive evidence of structure and organisation in your work;
- competent referencing style (this includes referencing and formatting).

To achieve mark up to 100%, you should demonstrate:

- a systematic focus and comprehensive engagement with the question, showing clear evidence of in-depth understanding of the issues;
- coherent, detailed knowledge and a systematic understanding of the subject area which is mostly informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline;
- systematic critical analysis, evaluation and reasoning skills;
- evidence of sophisticated engagement with literature and associated skills;
- evidence of sophisticated structure and organisation in your work;
- sophisticated referencing style (this includes referencing and formatting).

All levels should show excellent presentation of style (e.g., elegant, concise writing), grammar (error-free) and language (e.g., avoid colloquialism, repetition and verbatims).

Marking scale

Class	Scale	Mark	Descriptor
First	Excellent 1st	100	Work of original and exceptional quality which in the examiners' judgement merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
		94	Exceptional work of the highest quality, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. At final-year level: work may achieve or be close to publishable standard.
	High 1st	88	Very high quality work demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. Work which may extend existing debates or interpretations.
	Upper Mid 1st	82	
	Lower Mid 1st	78	
	Low 1st	74	
Upper Second (2.1)	High 2.1	68	High quality work demonstrating good knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills.
	Mid 2.1	65	
	Low 2.1	62	
Lower Second	High 2.2	58	Competent work, demonstrating reasonable knowledge and understanding, some analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills.
	Mid 2.2	55	
	Low 2.2	52	
Third	High 3rd	48	Work of limited quality, demonstrating some relevant knowledge and understanding.
	Mid 3rd	45	
	Low 3rd	42	
Fail	High Fail (sub Honours)	38	Work does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Evidence of study and demonstrates some knowledge and some basic understanding of relevant concepts and techniques, but subject to significant omissions and errors.
	Fail	32	Work is significantly below the standard required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Some evidence of study and some knowledge and evidence of understanding but subject to very serious omissions and errors.
		25	Poor quality work well below the standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree.
	Low Fail	12	
Zero	Zero	0	Work of no merit OR Absent, work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases

