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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course  Title | **BSc (Hons) in Software Development****BSc (Hons) in Multimedia Software Development****BSc (Hons) in Computer Systems and Networks****BSc (Hons) in Business Analytics** | | | **Lecturer Name & Surname** | | Dr. Conrad AquilinaMs. Ruth S. Vella | |
| Unit Number & Title | | CDKSK-503-1908 English II | | | | | |
| Assignment Number, Title / Type | | 1. Literature Review (Home) | | | | | |
| Date Set | | 03 April 2023 | Deadline Date | 30 April 2023 | | | |
| Student Name | Andrea Baldacchino | | ID Number | 349000L | Class / Group | | 6.1A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Maximum Mark |
| KU1.1 Identify relevant and suitable information from secondary academic sources. | 10 |
| KU2.1 Present a suitable introduction to own research field or research statement. | 5 |
| KU2.3 Present a summative conclusion on salient points discussed. | 5 |
| AA2.2 Develop a research idea in the form of a research statement or theoretical/literature review. | 15 |
| SE1.2 Synthesise arguments, ideas and data from secondary academic sources. | 15 |
| Total Mark | 50 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Notes to Students:** |
| * This assignment brief has been approved and released by the Internal Verifier through Classter. * Assessment marks and feedback by the lecturer will be available online via Classter (<Http://mcast.classter.com>) following release by the Internal Verifier. * Students submitting their assignment on Moodle/Turnitin will be requested to confirm online the following statements:   **Student’s declaration prior to handing-in of assignment**   * I certify that the work submitted for this assignment is my own and that I have read and understood the respective Plagiarism Policy   **Student’s declaration on assessment special arrangements**   * I certify that adequate support was given to me during the assignment through the Institute and/or the Inclusive Education Unit. * I declare that I refused the special support offered by the Institute. |

English II (Level 6)

*Assignment 1: Literature Review*

**Assignment Guidelines**

* This is a **home assignment** of 4 weeks’ duration.
* Research topic ideas/statements which have **not been vetted** by your course tutor prior to the submission date will **not be considered**.
* This assignment must be **uploaded in .doc format** on each group’s respective **Turnitin portal** on the VLE by the cut-off date indicated.
* A **hardcopy** of this assignment must also be presented during your first lecture on the week commencing Monday 01 May 2023.
* You must type your assignment in the respective sections of the template provided.
* **Late submissions or submissions by email will not be accepted.**
* A detailed **rubric at the end of the assignment** indicates how marks are allocated.
* The College operates a cheating/**plagiarism policy** and any copied work will be penalised according to this policy.
* In all tasks, **proper use of grammar, spelling and punctuation is expected.**

**Background to this assignment**

This assignment focuses on the **academic reading and writing skills** that are required for **pre-dissertation research**.

1. You will need to **identify, select, and consult information from** **6-8** **academic sources**, followed by a **proper review of their content**. For the purposes of this assignment, academic sources would be any of the following: scholarly articles from academic databases and journals, dissertations, reports, conference proceedings, and book chapters.
2. A number of the sources selected need to be **actual studies conducted by others**. This is because your literature review should **analyse,** **compare, and discuss approaches/techniques and results** where available.
3. Before starting work on your literature review, present your course tutor with **a short research statement with a clearly defined scope**. Based on your tutor’s feedback, you will be in a position to structure your suggested project topic, modify it, or select another.
4. Your project topic must be **relevant to your area of specialisation** (software, business analytics, networking or multimedia). You should assume that the topic you select could potentially lead to an implementable project leading to a BSc. IT degree. (Therefore, research questions/statements such as: *How will ChatGPT take over human jobs?*, *Why is it important for companies to have proper data back-up solutions?* or *The benefits of e-learning in today’s education* are inapplicable and quite irrelevant to your degree programme in their current form).
5. **Your review should correspond to the template provided on the next page**. Please follow this template for specific word ranges and expected content per section. The use of sub-sections is necessary for better organisation of content.
6. All sourced content and ideas must carry in-text citations (in IEEE format). Avoid direct quoting unless absolutely essential.

|  |
| --- |
| Name and Surname: Andrea Baldacchino |
| Course programme : Software Development, SWD |
| Title |
| Area of study and research topic being proposed (approx. 50 words)  *Outline the research area/s and clarify the research topic falling within this area.* |
| Research statement or question/s being addressed (approx. 100 words)  *Define the scope of your research topic by identifying specific issues to be investigated. Explain why it merits investigation.*  How can an AI create a companion for the elderly?  Creating a digital companion using AI  In these past years AI has had some significant progress, and a promising application is the development of a digital companion.  A digital companion is a software that would be able to interact with people, mimicking the interactions between two humans thus providing individuals with emotional support and entertainment. The digital companion would be able to provide a social connectedness and improve mental health. To be able to create this software we would have to look at the technical, societal, and ethical aspects of it. For the technical aspects there is NLP (Natural Language Programming), machine learning and image recognition. For societal and ethical aspects there are issues regarding bias, transparency, and privacy.  The development of a digital companion using AI presents many opportunities for enhancing human well-being, for example by being able to provide the elderly a companion, and in turn reducing the loneliness that comes with aging, helping combat depression in older generations. However, addressing the technical, ethical, and societal challenges is critical to develop and truly understand these technologies full potential. |
| Background (approx. 200-250 words)  *Provide a suitable introduction to the topic, typically by providing an overview of any specialist terms/concepts associated with the topic. You may also want to mention key developments via a chronological outline.* |
| Related work (approx. 700-800 words)  *Summarise and compare relevant approaches to the research area. Link a minimum of 3 studies here. Comment on any significant findings from these studies. Remember to use sub-sections.* |
| Summative conclusion (approx. 100-150 words)  *Provide a suitable conclusion that summarises salient information in relation to your research topic. Focus on techniques and findings, and note which research deserves further study.* |
| References (6-8 academic sources)  *All sources must be cited throughout the document and reproduced in full as IEEE references.* |

END OF ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria and Total Mark | Category | Marks Not Awarded | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
| KU1.1  10 marks | *Academic*  *Sources* | Information given is unidentifiable and/or uncited.  No academic sources are used.  **0 marks** | Less than 4 sources and the majority of are not reputable or reliable academic sources of information.  Source information may also be largely irrelevant to research topic.  **1-3 marks** | Between 5-6 reputable sources of information, which may not all be entirely academic.  Some source information may not be entirely relevant to research topic.  **4-6 marks** | Between 7-8 reputable and reliable academic sources of information.  Source information is generally relevant and necessary to research topic.  **7-8 marks** | Eight or more reputable and reliable academic sources of information.  All content retrieved from journal databases or scholarly sources. Information is entirely relevant to research topic.  **9-10 marks** |
| KU2.1  5 marks | *Background* | Background to the literature review is missing or severely underwritten.  No use of specialist terms/definitions.  **0 marks** | Background to the literature review is underwritten and lacks use of specialist terms/definitions.  There is little attempt to provide context.  **1-2 marks** | Background to the literature review meets word requirements but lacks use of specialist terms/definitions.  There is little attempt to provide context.  **3 marks** | Background to the literature review meets word requirements.  Some use of specialist terms/definitions. Context is established.  **4 marks** | Background to the literature review meets word requirements.  Good use of specialist terms/definitions.  Context is established.  **5 marks** |
| AA2.2  15 marks | *Research Statement &*  *Related Work* | Research statement section lacks a well-defined scope or is missing.  Related work section is severely underwritten, is missing or is practically entirely plagiarised.  **0-2 marks** | Research statement section lacks a well-defined scope or does not outline issues.  R  elated work section is severely underwritten, with very limited paraphrasing.  Related work section is only based on one study.  **3-5 marks** | Research statement section is appropriate.  Related work section meets length requirements but has limited paraphrasing or incorrect use of information and citations.  Related work section is only based on two studies.  **6-8 marks** | Research statement section is appropriate.  Related work section meets length requirements and makes good use of paraphrasing. Minor mistakes in language use and citations.  Related work section makes use of three studies.  **9-12 marks** | Research statement section has a well-defined scope and raises the necessary issues.  Related work section meets/exceeds length requirements with extensive and appropriate use of paraphrasing and citations.  Related work section makes use of three or more studies.  **13-15 marks** |
| SE1.2  15 marks | *Evaluate Source Information* | Source information is not grouped by similarity of content into sections.  There is little to no analysis or contrast of source data. Content is merely paraphrased and randomly listed.  No discussion of key approaches and findings present in secondary sources.  **0-2 marks** | Some sectioning of information is present but content is not entirely grouped by similarity.  Research data mostly lacks analysis or comparison and is simply paraphrased without further evaluation.  No discussion of key approaches and findings present in secondary sources.  **3-5 marks** | Source information is grouped by similarity of content into sections.  Research data is discussed with some attempt at comparison and contrast.  Some discussion of key approaches and findings which are made relatable to the proposed study.  **6-8 marks** | Source information is grouped by similarity of content into sections.  Research data is discussed with a better attempt at comparison and contrast of key ideas.  Good discussion of key approaches and findings which are made relatable to the proposed study.  **9-12 marks** | Source information is grouped by similarity of content into sections.  Research data is fully discussed with constant comparison and contrast of key ideas.  Good discussion of key approaches and findings which are properly linked to the proposed study.  **13-15 marks** |
| KU2.3  5 marks | *Conclusion* | Conclusion is missing, does not provide a summative review of techniques and findings or is severely underwritten, with extensive errors in writing.  **0 marks** | Conclusion is underwritten or does not provide a summative review of techniques and findings.  Link to own topic issues is missing.  **1-2 marks** | Conclusion is of appropriate length and provides a summative review of techniques and findings.  Link to own topic issues is missing.  **3 marks** | Conclusion is of good length and provides a summative review of techniques and findings.  Link to own topic issues is present, to an extent.  **4 marks** | Conclusion is of good length and provides a summative review of techniques and findings.  Link to own topic issues is fully established.  **5 marks** |

\*Marks deducted for under-writing as well as frequent mistakes in language use, lack of cohesion, and syntax. Properly revise your writing before submission.