

ELISHA MENSAH

EIA.docx

 REMOTE PATIENT MONITORING; A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TRADITIONAL AND MOBILE TECHNOLOGY-ENABLED MONITORING AND EV...

 Eli Research

 Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::1:3305206193

Submission Date

Jul 30, 2025, 11:06 AM GMT

Download Date

Jul 30, 2025, 11:08 AM GMT

File Name

EIA.docx

File Size

15.6 KB

2 Pages

643 Words

4,346 Characters

100% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups



1 AI-generated only 100%

Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.



0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%

Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



The data presented examines the relationship between the number of times individuals were displaced after their initial displacement and their current displaced status, categorized as either Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) or Refugees. The distribution provides insight into patterns of repeated displacement and its association with the type of displacement status. Overall, the data reveals that 71.6% of the respondents are internally displaced, while 28.4% are refugees, indicating that internal displacement is the predominant experience among the surveyed population (UNHCR, 2022).

A closer examination of the frequency of displacement shows notable patterns. Among those displaced only once, the majority (76.72%) are internally displaced, while 23.28% are refugees. This suggests that single displacements are more common among IDPs, reflecting localized conflicts, disasters, or other crises that force movement within national borders rather than across them (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre [IDMC], 2021). Similarly, respondents who reported no displacement after the first instance also show a similar pattern, with 76.98% classified as internally displaced and 23.02% as refugees. These figures indicate that for most individuals who experience either no subsequent displacement or only a single displacement event, internal displacement tends to be the dominant status. This may be linked to factors such as proximity to home regions, socio-political dynamics that restrict cross-border movement, or local reintegration efforts within the country (Brookings Institution, 2019).

In contrast, patterns shift significantly among those who experienced two or more displacements. For individuals displaced twice, the majority (88.57%) are refugees, while only 11.43% are internally displaced. This stark reversal suggests that repeated displacement increases the likelihood of crossing international borders, possibly driven by deteriorating security conditions, limited humanitarian support in initial areas of refuge, or protracted crises that make local resettlement unsustainable (UNHCR, 2020). The situation is even more pronounced for those displaced three times, where 100% are refugees, indicating that multiple displacement events almost invariably lead to refugee status. This trend underscores the escalating instability faced by individuals repeatedly uprooted from their homes and reflects the growing necessity of seeking refuge beyond national boundaries in search of safety and stability (Ferris et al., 2011).

Overall, the relationship between repeated displacement and displaced status reflects a clear pattern: individuals with fewer displacement episodes tend to remain internally displaced, while those subjected to multiple displacements are increasingly likely to become refugees. This dynamic highlights the progressive vulnerability and instability experienced by repeatedly displaced individuals, where each subsequent displacement pushes them further from their original homes and often across international borders (Crawford & Keen, 2018). Such patterns could be indicative of intensifying conflict zones, recurrent disasters, or systemic failures in domestic support systems that compel individuals to seek refuge abroad.

From a humanitarian and policy perspective, these findings have important implications. The dominance of internal displacement among those with single or no further displacements suggests that national-level interventions and localized support mechanisms remain critical for stabilizing populations early in displacement cycles. Conversely, the sharp rise in refugee status among those with repeated displacements underscores the need for international cooperation, cross-border humanitarian frameworks, and durable solutions for protracted displacement.

scenarios (IOM, 2021). By examining these trends, the data provides a foundation for targeted interventions that address both the immediate needs of IDPs and the complex challenges faced by refugees subjected to multiple displacements.

References

Brookings Institution. (2019). *Improving the response to internal displacement: A policy agenda*. <https://www.brookings.edu>

Crawford, N., & Keen, D. (2018). *The causes and consequences of displacement in conflict-affected regions*. Overseas Development Institute.

Ferris, E., Mooney, E., & Stark, C. (2011). *From responsibility to response: Assessing national approaches to internal displacement*. Brookings Institution.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2021). *World migration report 2022*. <https://www.iom.int/wmr>

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2021). *Global report on internal displacement*. <https://www.internal-displacement.org>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2020). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2019*. <https://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2019>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2022). *Mid-Year Trends Report*. <https://www.unhcr.org>