



**Faculty of Information Technology**  
**FIT4005/5125/5143 Research Methods in IT**  
**Semester 2, 2020**

**Assignment 1: Weeks 2 & 3**

**Submission:** Post-workshop Exercises for Weeks 2 & 3

**Value:** This assignment is worth 20% of the total marks for FIT4005/FIT5125/FIT5143

**Assignment due date:** The submission is due: 11:55pm Thursday, Week 4 (27th of August 2020).

**Submission method:** Submit to Moodle a single PDF document combining your answers to post-workshop exercises for Week 2 (Research Ethics, see Page 3) and Week 3 (Literature Review, see Page 4).

## Assignment criteria

This assignment comprises the post-workshop exercises for Weeks 2 to 3.

Weighting of Assessment: 20% of marks for units FIT4005/5125/5143

Week 2 Research Ethics Weighting: [20 marks]	Week 3 Research Literature Weighting: [20 marks]
See page 3.	See Page 4.

This is an individual assignment; it must be your own work and expressed in your own words.

Assessment criteria:

(i) The following criteria will be used to determine the score for the assignment:

- Content and completeness of tasks
- Clarity and relevance of content
- Level of critical analysis
- Logical structure and organization of ideas
- Use of references (where appropriate)
- Format, grammar, spelling etc.

(ii) Note that plagiarism detection procedures may be applied to each submission. See the University rules and regulations regarding plagiarism and resulting penalties. Any case of plagiarism detected will mean automatic failure of the entire assignment.

(iii) Late submissions will incur a penalty of 5% per day.

## Assessed Post-workshop Exercise (Week 2)

The aim of this assessment is to evaluate your understanding of research ethics, and your ability to assess your ability to apply this research to the evaluation of research designs.

This exercise must to be completed by the Week 4 submission deadline for Assignment 1 (see Moodle).

Submission requirements for Assignment 1 can be found on Moodle, and will be a combination of the assessed post-workshop exercise for weeks 2 and 3.

This is an individual exercise that forms part of the assessment for the unit, you must therefore work alone and follow Monash University's policies, procedures and regulations relating academic integrity, plagiarism and collusion (see Moodle).

Tutor feedback will not be provided for this exercise, but feedback on other workshop activities should be of help to you in completing this exercise.

There is a strict word limit of 600 words for this exercise. For submission over this length only the first 600 words of answers will be awarded marks.

### Exercise (Week 2)

"Shaping the Design of Smartphone-Based Interventions for Self-Harm"

**Consider the following paper:**

Honary, M., Bell, B., Clinch, S., Vega, J., Kroll, L., Sefi, A. and McNaney, R., 2020. Shaping the Design of Smartphone-Based Interventions for Self-Harm. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376370>

**In 600 words (or less) identify and explain what you consider to be the most significant ethical issues relating to the design of the research, and/or the conduct of the research, and/or any other aspect of the research as reported in the paper.**

You can include any issues your consider important, whether they are specifically referred to in the paper or not.

## Assessed Post-workshop Exercise (Week 3)

The aim of this assessment is to evaluate your ability to identify potentially relevant literature sources by reviewing abstracts of citations of a key paper.

This exercise must be completed by the Week 4 submission deadline for Assignment 1 (see Moodle).

Submission requirements for Assignment 1 can be found on Moodle, and will be a combination of the assessed post-workshop exercise for weeks 2 and 3.

This is an individual exercise that forms part of the assessment for the unit, you must therefore work alone and follow Monash University's policies, procedures and regulations relating academic integrity, plagiarism and collusion (see Moodle).

Tutor feedback will not be provided for this exercise, but feedback on other workshop activities should be of help to you in completing this exercise.

There is a strict word limit of 600 words for the overall justification text. For submissions

### Exercise (Week 3)

#### "Citing papers: Relevance Evaluation"

##### Consider the following paper:

Welsh, D., Morrissey, K., Foley, S., McNaney, R., Salis, C., McCarthy, J., & Vines, J. (2018). *Ticket to talk: Supporting conversation between young people and people with dementia through digital media*. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*, 2018-April, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173949>

##### Use Google Scholar the find works that have cited this paper since it was published.

Based on your reading of the abstracts of these works ONLY (i.e. you must not consider any other content in the paper) your task is to identify the 5 works most likely to be relevant to the research of: "Ticket to talk: Supporting conversation between young people and people with dementia through digital media".

**List these 5 works (using the APA citation format) in order of likely relevance (1= most relevant, etc.) taking into account the venue of publication and your reading of the abstracts, and write a justification for your inclusion and ranking of the paper.**

*Format you answer as a table as follows:*

Paper	Justification
1. <APA reference for paper 1 here>	<justification for paper 1 here>
2. <APA reference for paper 2 here>	<justification for paper 2 here>
3. <APA reference for paper 3 here>	<justification for paper 3 here>
4. <APA reference for paper 4 here>	<justification for paper 4 here>
5. <APA reference for paper 5 here>	<justification for paper 5 here>

## Research methods for IT FIT4005/5125/5143 – Assignment 1 – Research ethics and literature (20%)

Assignment criteria	N - three or more of the following:	P - mostly the following:	C - mostly the following:	D – mostly the following:	HD mostly the following:
<b>Research ethics</b>					
<b>Ethical issues</b>	Ethical issues not relevant to the assignment. Descriptions are not clear and detailed.	Ethical issues are not clear. Identification of only 1 relevant issue is present and clear.	Ethical issues and descriptions are partly clear. Only 2 relevant ethical dimensions are clear. Description still needs further revision.	Good choice of ethical issues chosen. Good level description of at least 3 ethical issues.	Excellent choice of ethical dimensions detail. High level detail of at least 3 relevant issues. The relevant ethical issues are clear described and outlined.
<b>Ethical dimensions and justification</b>	Ethical dimensions not relevant to the assignment. Justification is not clear and does not relate back to the main research focus.	Ethical dimensions and ethical issues are somewhat relevant to the assignment. Clear outline of at least 1-2 is present. Justifications needs further revision.	Good description of ethical issues and dimensions. Clear outline of at least 2-3 relevant examples is present. Standard justifications.	High standard of ethical issues and relevant dimensions. Clear and convincing description of at least 3 relevant examples is present. Good quality justification.	High level description of ethical issues and relevant dimensions. Describes all 3 relevant examples in detail. High level justifications.
<b>Literature</b>					
<b>Justification of content</b>	Justification does not make sense and further detail is required.  Unclear description and ranking of each paper, not clear.	Significant aspects are unclear, justification of each research paper can include further critical analysis. Limited description. Ranking of each paper has some concerns.	Justification of each research paper can include further critical analysis. Limited description. Ranking of each paper can be more relevant.	Good detail on justification of each research paper with a clear argument and does not repeat the abstract. Great description and ranking of each paper.	High level justification of each research paper with a clear argument and does not repeat the abstract. Excellent description and ranking of each paper.
<b>Quality of writing</b>	Major revision is required, and spelling, grammar and writing must be revise. Difficult to understand sentences.	Significant spelling errors. Most spelling, punctuation, and grammar correct allowing reader to progress though work	Few spelling errors present. Punctuation, grammatical errors, and few fragments.	Quality of writing is at high standard; no distracting spelling errors.	Excellent standard and quality of writing. Quality of the writing is outstanding and engaging. No spelling errors or distractions present.