

# KF7004 – MComp Computing Research Project

## Reflection

16018262

Sept 22

Word count:

### Contents

<b>1 Possible Topics</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 group vs individual</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Background, Motivation, Relevance, Sources of Knowledge</b>	<b>2</b>

## 1 Possible Topics

- Lack of support - Can possibly use theory around support and outcomes?
- ethics - difficulties due to new methods etc.
- was this research too big
- Gantt chart or lack thereof makes the work easier and more agile, Agile development, which is an iterative approach to software development, can provide more flexibility in the development process,

## 2 group vs individual

The work for this module was meant to be undertaken as a group research project, however it was decided early on that I would complete it as an individual. Primarily due to the fact that the work was heavily linked to the work carried out for my undergrad dissertation. Most of the underlying software was written as a part of my dissertation, therefore most of the work was identifying small improvements that could be made. Then developing a methodology to prove that accuracy of the program. It may have been useful to get new ideas in, which may have led to a better outcome. If I were to have worked in a group the collaboration would have been beneficial as Robert E. Levasseur (2010) states, "to initiate and... the high level of two-way communication" (Levasseur 2010). Collaboration leads to greater success in group projects if done well. Despite not being in a group I was still able to have effective communication with a lecturer in the department. Although they did not have any knowledge of cyber-security, they did know a lot about programming algorithms. I was able to take ideas to them and they would know how to implement them, without disagreement over the direction the project took.

Although I was primarily working alone, I did receive a lot of assistance from academic staff. This worked quite well due to the fact that the academic does not have any knowledge of cybersecurity, which meant that I was free to experiment and he was able to advise all the methods used without getting caught up in the smaller details, due to his knowledge of algorithms. Furthermore, the academic staff had prior knowledge of the project, due to supervision at undergraduate level and therefore understood the project and its complexities. This resulted in a more comprehensive approach to the problem; Thurow et al. argues that multidisciplinary settings allows individuals from different disciplines to contribute their disciplinary perspectives in an attempt to solve complex problems. An example of this is, when analysing the user agents, I had originally tried to implement a Levenshtein distance to try and find the nearest user agent. However, the academic suggested doing a bag of words approach, which was ultimately a stronger and more accurate methodology.

Because there was a lack of research in the area I was researching, it may have made it challenging for someone to join the project and be able to completely understand the complexity of the project. Theoretically by working alone it made the ethics application easier, as I relied on getting data from customer websites. They already knew who I was and as a result were more willing to share their data with me for this project as well. However, there were times when having more than one dedicated researcher would have been beneficial. For example, when classifying the accuracy of the program it might have been beneficial to have someone to classify the data as well. This would help to remove any bias that I might have had.

If this had been an entirely new project it would have been beneficial to collaborate with more than one person. To bring in new ideas and a different point of view. However due to the fact that it was a continuation I believe it was the right decision to do it on my own.

### 3 Background, Motivation, Relevance, Sources of Knowledge

Throughout this project, there have been many stages where reflection has been needed in order to understand the progress that has been made. At times, progress has felt limited and non-existent. However, these periods have allowed for reflection. By regularly putting my research on hold and taking a step back, I was able to develop a regular reflective habit (Dyment and O'connell 2010). However, at other times throughout the year, there have been ongoing issues with a lack of available support in order to complete work. There have been periods where reflection in action have been required. Often when reflection in action, we are often unaware that we have derived meaning from an experience, however we find ourselves doing the same action again, as it has a positive outcome (Schon 1983). By reflecting in action, it allows me to reflect on where I was in the project, and what I needed to do to progress thus resulting in more effective decision making and problem solving. This was mainly evident by last minutes changes made to my proposal, meaning I had to reflect on how to get this done. This meant having to do an online zoom session, so that someone was able to assess me to get changes done. The positive outcome here was that I got the work done and I was able to learn that doing work on zoom, although not ideal, still contributed to the success of the project.

The project undertaken was a continuation of my undergraduate project, looking at a new way to detect attacks on websites. The motivation of this was to solve a challenge that I faced, running my own website. The lack of literature in this area to do with cyber security was surprising, however this led to freedom in creating a new methodology. Due to the fact that there was no existing methodology, apart from my own, I had to combine some existing techniques and test some new ones. Due to the lack of relevant literature, the literature review was challenging to construct. Therefore it became more about identifying gaps in previous work. Hertz (1997) points out that 'the reflective researcher does not merely report the findings of the research but at the same time questions and explains how those findings are constructed'. (CITE) This shows that I was be able to reflect on the available literature and ask questions that led to my hypothesis. A

lot of these questions were not complicated in nature, but came from a working knowledge of websites and servers, the key lesson that I learned in this was that just by asking simple questions about the research, it was easy to identify flaws

While the ethical implications of this work will be discussed in a later section, it is important to reflect on the ethical process. Due to the ambiguity of user consent in the collection of website log data, and whether users had given informed consent about the collection. Websites say that data can be analysed however due to the university policy of expressed consent, there were questions about whether the data could be used. However, due to the study wanting real-world data, this might have changed user behaviour, knowing that they would've been tracked. This was done to mitigate the effects of possible confounding variables, such as social desirability. Studies have suggested that individuals online behaviour changed when they are being monitored.

## References

- Dyment, Janet E and Timothy S O'connell (2010). "The quality of reflection in student journals: A review of limiting and enabling factors". In: *Innovative Higher Education* 35, pp. 233–244.
- Levasseur, Robert E (2010). "People skills: Ensuring project success—A change management perspective". In: *Interfaces* 40.2, pp. 159–162.
- Schon, D (1983). *The reflective practitioner. How professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.
- Thurrow, Amy Purvis et al. (1999). "The dynamics of multidisciplinary research teams in academia". In: *The review of higher education* 22.4, pp. 425–440.