Title: **Final Report**

Submission deadline: **12 noon, 15th August 2025**

This assessment contributes **45%** of the total module mark and assesses the following **Intended Learning Outcomes**

- Demonstrate knowledge of a research topic relevant to your programme of study, acquired through a deep and self-motivated exploration of that topic
- Design and follow systematically the steps of research project development
- Apply complex and appropriate analysis and development techniques at each stage of the project
- Show familiarity with the background and context of a new application area
- Work in an interdisciplinary area of relevance to your programme of study.
- Conduct independent study, including library and web-based research
- Reflect critically on processes and products
- Plan an extended project and manage time effectively
- Present work to a non-specialist audience

This is an **individual** work, and you are reminded of the University's Regulations on Plagiarism. You must avoid plagiarism, collusion and any academic misconduct behaviours. See further resources about Academic Honesty and Plagiarism.

Use of GenAI tools in COMM514, ECMM454, COMM424DA – MSc Project Final Report
The University of Exeter is committed to supporting the ethical and responsible use of Generative AI (GenAI) tools in teaching and learning. You can find student resources on GenAI on the Study Skills pages.

Direct copying of content, including AI-generated content, without proper acknowledgement falls under plagiarism and misrepresentation. See guidance on referencing AI work and TQA section 12.3.

To provide clarity on uses of AI, assessments can fall in three categories:
- AI-Integrated
- AI-Supported
- AI-Prohibited

This assessment falls under the category of **AI-supported** assessment, where ethical and responsible use of GenAI tools in the development of an assessment is supported. This may include using GenAI tools to summarise literature, improve the structure of your work or quality of English language. All use of GenAI tools should be acknowledged in a statement submitted with their assessment and referenced appropriately. Students are asked to keep a record of the tools, prompts and outputs used so they are able to produce these if necessary at a viva and demonstrate how they have built on this content to ensure the work is original.

Declaration of use (AI-supported or AI-integrated work only):
Include this declaration at the start of your work.
Select all that apply with an [X]:
-----✂----- Copy and fill in this declaration at the start of your work ----✂-----
I acknowledge the following uses of GenAI tools in this assessment:
- [ ] I have used GenAI tools to:
    - [ ] develop ideas.
    - [ ] assist with research or gathering information.
    - [ ] help me understand key theories and concepts.
    - [ ] identify trends and themes as part of my data analysis
    - [ ] suggest a plan or structure for my assessment.
    - [ ] give me feedback on a draft.
    - [ ] generate images, figures or diagrams.
    - [ ] proofread and correct grammar or spelling errors.
    - [ ] generate citations or references.
    - [ ] Other: [please specify]
- [ ] I have not used any GenAI tools in preparing this assessment.

I declare that I have referenced all use of GenAI outputs within my assessment in line with the University referencing guidelines.

I certify that all material in this dissertation which is not my own has been identified.
-----✂--------- End of declaration – Do not include 'scissor' lines ---------✂-----
If a declaration cannot be attached (e.g. video submission), by submitting your work, you confirm you have followed the assessment brief and guidelines on AI use.

Instructions

This submission collects the work you have undertaken during your project. Your submission must comprise:

1. **A PDF report** describing the project should be submitted to ELE2 via the "Final Report (PDF Submission only)" assessment submission portal. Details of the report requirements are below.

2. Your code, survey instruments (if applicable) and data should be compressed into **a Zip file** and submitted to ELE2 via the "Final Report (Code Submission only)" submission portal. If the file is too large to upload, you should instead provide a Zip file stored in your University of Exeter OneDrive. You then must **create a shareable link to the Zip file**, which **must be submitted in a text file to ELE2**. Permissions must be set to **allow access to "any one in your organisation"**. The shared file will not be accessible to anyone without the link. **It is your responsibility to ensure that the link works prior to submission** – if it does not work, we will not be able to examine it during the marking process.

These items must be submitted to ELE2 before the deadline shown on the cover of this document.

STRUCTURE OF A PROJECT FINAL REPORT

As with the proposal, the structure of a good project report depends on the type of the project, i.e., there is no "one-size-fits-all" structure. In the following, we will present a few possible structures of your report. They are only examples, and you should discuss the structure of your report with your supervisor so that it fits your research project.

Note that the full submission for this assessment has multiple parts. The main component is the report document. This will be divided into the following parts:

1) A separate **title page** containing your name, a 200-250 word abstract.
2) A signed **declaration page** containing two *declarations* (not counting towards the page limit) that should follow as one paragraph each after the conclusion of the main part:
   a) A declaration that the presented work is your own. This should read as follows:
      Declaration of Originality. I am aware of and understand the University of Exeter's policy on plagiarism and I certify that this assignment is my own work, except where indicated by referencing, and that I have followed the good academic practices.

   b) A declaration of any ethical concerns that could be raised by your research. This declaration is also mandatory if no ethical concerns are raised by your research. In this case, it could read as follows:
      Declaration of Ethical Concerns. This work does not raise any ethical issues. No human or animal subjects are involved neither has personal data of human subjects been processed. Also no security or safety critical activities have been carried out.

      Note that not only working with human subjects might require an ethics approval or a further discussion of ethical aspects of your project. For example, also the processing personal data (even if obtained from public sources), analysing third party systems to detect security or safety issues, or revealing security or safety weaknesses can require an ethical assessment of your work. If, in your project proposal, you identified that you work requires an ethics approval, this should be stated here and that it has been obtained, your statement should state this explicitly. If you used, e.g., consent forms in activities involving humans, those should be included in an appendix.

3) A **table of contents**, immediately following the declaration page.
4) The **main text** which must not exceed **20 sides of A4** in an **11pt font** with **margins of 2cm** (single column and single line spacing). Tables and figures can have a smaller font – no smaller than 9 points (**you must ensure that all figures and tables are legible**).
5) The **bibliography**, also in a font not less than 11pt. It is expected that this section will take up at least half a side of A4 and is not likely to exceed three sides.
6) An optional **appendix** or multiple appendices, which also follow the main text and are not included in the page limit.

Please note: A 5-mark deduction will be applied for each page by which the length of the document exceeds 20 pages. **The title page, declaration page, contents page, bibliography and appendices do not count toward the 20-page limit**.

Please also note that the main text should be 'complete'; that is, the report should make sense without needing to look at any of the appendices. Importantly, only the main text will be assessed. While you may include one or more appendices as a way of providing additional content in support of the main text, the marker may decide not to look at them and you will not get any marks for them directly.

Please see overleaf for marking criteria.

MARKING SCHEME

The project report is a summative assessment, accounting for 45% of the module mark. In the following subsections, we will describe the five marking criteria (they are the same criteria that we discussed in section II) against which your report will be assessed.

Criteria:
- Introduction, Background, and Context (25%): This criterion assesses how well the student introduces and contextualises their research, demonstrating familiarity with the relevant academic field.
- Rigour (25%): This criterion evaluates the *methodological soundness* of the research, including the design, implementation, and analysis.
- Contribution (25%): This section assesses the *significance and impact* of the research, including findings, novelty, and implications.
- Discussion (25%): This criterion evaluates the *critical engagement* with the findings, limitations, and broader implications.

	Introduction, Background, & Context (25%)	Rigour (25%)	Contribution (25%)	Discussion (25%)
Distinction (70-100%)	The introduction is clear, compelling, and logically structured. The research problem is clearly defined and justified with a strong rationale for its significance. The background section demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the field, with relevant academic literature critically analysed. The research gap is explicitly identified, showing how the study contributes to the field. High-quality academic sources are cited and synthesised effectively.	The methodology is comprehensive, well-justified, and logically structured. The research design aligns with the objectives, ensuring validity and feasibility. The methods for data collection and analysis are well-defined and appropriately chosen. The limitations of the methodology are clearly acknowledged, with strategies to mitigate them. Ethical considerations are addressed in depth.	The research clearly defines an original and significant contribution to the field. The findings are well-explained and aligned with research objectives. The originality and relevance of the work are thoroughly justified. The study provides insights that can be applied in academic, practical, or societal contexts.	The discussion is highly insightful, demonstrating critical engagement with findings. Research outcomes are clearly interpreted and linked to the research aims. Limitations are acknowledged with thoughtful reflection on their impact. The feasibility of the research is well-justified, with recommendations for further work. Ethical and practical implications are considered in depth.
Merit (60-69%)	The introduction is structured and clear, but some aspects lack depth. The background is relevant but may not fully establish a clear research gap. The research problem is stated but could be further justified with additional evidence. Some references may be used without critical discussion or synthesis.	The methodology is mostly clear and appropriate, but some aspects lack depth. The research design is logical and structured but could be better justified. Data collection and analysis methods are described but could be more detailed. Ethical considerations are included but may need more depth.	The research makes a clear contribution, but some aspects of originality or significance could be better justified. The findings are relevant but may lack strong novelty or impact. The study contributes to the field, but its potential impact is not fully developed.	The discussion is engaged and well-structured, though some areas lack depth. Findings are connected to the research aims but may not be fully explored. Limitations are acknowledged but could be more critically examined. Ethical considerations are present but lack detail.
Pass (50-59%)	The introduction presents a general topic but lacks depth or coherence. The background is superficial, with limited engagement with relevant literature. The research problem is not clearly defined, making the study's focus unclear. Limited references and weak integration of academic sources.	The methodology is outlined but lacks depth or justification. Key aspects (e.g., data sources, analysis techniques) may be unclear or poorly justified. The research design may not fully align with the study objectives, making feasibility questionable. Limited discussion of ethical considerations.	The research topic is relevant but lacks a clear contribution. The originality of the work is unclear or not well justified. The report does not fully articulate how findings will benefit the field.	The discussion states findings but lacks critical analysis. Limitations are briefly mentioned but not examined in depth. Feasibility is unclear or weakly justified. The report does not sufficiently discuss challenges, risks, or future research directions.
Fail (40-49%)	The introduction is unclear, missing, or poorly structured. The research problem is vague or absent, showing no clear focus. There is little or no engagement with existing literature.	The methodology is poorly defined or absent. The research plan is unclear, unrealistic, or lacks feasibility. There is no discussion of data collection, analysis, or ethical concerns.	The research lacks originality and does not demonstrate a meaningful contribution. The study appears trivial or redundant with no clear research gap.	The discussion is superficial or absent. Findings are not critically analysed. The report lacks a realistic feasibility assessment. Ethical issues are ignored or not acknowledged.