

Cardiff School of Technologies

Assessment Brief

Module Code

CIS6004

Module Title

Professional & Ethical Issues in IT

Academic Year

2023/2024

Semester

Semester 2

Module Leader email

fcarroll@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Content

Assessment Details	2
Submission Details	4
Assessment Criteria	5
Further Information	6
Who can answer questions about my assessment?	6
Referencing	6
Submission problems	6
Unfair academic practice	6
How is my work graded?	6

Assessment Details

Assessment title	Abr.	Weighting
------------------	------	-----------

WRIT1 – Coursework	WRIT1	100%
--------------------	-------	------

Pass marks are 40% for undergraduate work and 50% for postgraduate work unless stated otherwise.

This assignment is made up of two parts:

1. Case study and questions

Read the below case study and answer all three questions a, b & c.

Case Study: On Recommendation Algorithms and What Makes Us Boring? by Irina Raicu

Wired magazine's "spiritual advice columnist," Meghan O'Ghiebyln, recently replied to a reader who noted that a streaming music app is "scarily good at predicting songs" that the reader would like and asked, "Does that make me boring?"

O'Ghiebyln redefined the question: "I'm willing to bet," she wrote, "that your real anxiety is not that you're boring but that you're not truly free. If your taste can be so easily inferred from your listening history and the data streams of 'users like you' (to borrow the patronizing argot of prediction engines), are you actually making a choice?"

Later in the column, however, she noted that users of services that include recommender algorithms, like the questioner, do make choices—but choices that are themselves shaped by the algorithms:

On TikTok, we quickly scroll past posts that don't reflect our dominant interests, lest the all-seeing algorithm mistake our curiosity for invested interest. Perhaps you have paused, once or twice, before watching a Netflix film that diverges from your usual taste, or hesitated before Googling a religious question, lest it take you for a true believer and skew your future search results.

These are choices born of restrictions. They are efforts to mollify the algorithm's rigid and itself limited perspective, lest it go from just overly simplifying to being outright wrong about our interests.

For the subset of users who understand the impact of the algorithms enough to try to appease them, the answer, then, is yes—that makes one boring; but the "that" is not the users' predictability but the compliance with the algorithms. In this scenario, it's the user who's been trained by the algorithm—not the other way around. The user acquiesces to being a shell of his or her "dominant interests," concerned about the consequences of trying (or learning about) new things.

While fully acknowledging this reality, O'Ghiebyln writes that she doesn't "advise embracing the irrational or acting against your own interests" as a response. "It will not make you happy," she argues, "nor will it prove a point." Disagreeing with this view, in a different take on recommendation algorithms, Clive Thompson (who also often writes for Wired) argues for "rewilding your attention"; he claims that acting out against the algorithms is not, in fact, against one's own real interests. As he puts it,

our truly quirky dimensions are never really grasped by these recommendation algorithms.... They're

not wrong about us; but they're woefully incomplete. This is why I always get a slightly flattened feeling when I behold my feed, robotically unloading boxes of content from the same monotonous conveyor-belt of recommendations, catered to some imaginary marketing version of my identity. It's like checking my reflection in the mirror and seeing stock-photo imagery.

In other words, to offer a different answer to the Wired questioner who asked about the music app, the recommendation algorithms do make you boring—and static—if you allow them to do all the work of finding music or other “content” for you.

To break that false mirror that Thompson mentions is therefore not to “embrace the irrational” but to try to embrace your full self. In his post, Thompson offers a variety of suggestions for how one might go about “rewilding” one’s imagination in an age of recommendation algorithms—while acknowledging that this requires more effort on our part.

If your music app’s recommendations are too accurate, you might not be boring but just stuck in a rut—perhaps in need of a reminder that might come (serendipitously) from a tweet by a bot that quotes prof. Richard Feynman: “You are under no obligation to remain the same person you were a year ago, a month ago, or even a day ago. You are here to create yourself, continuously.” It’s important, also, to note that recommendation algorithms used in the context of, say, music streaming apps have very different societal impacts than those used in social media feeds or in news media outlets. The latter categories of recommenders have been accused of being partly responsible for increased social polarization, filter bubbles that impede understanding, radicalization, and other significant negative consequences that go far beyond making us “boring.”

- a) You are a computer graduate about to start a job with an AI company involved in the development and deployment of recommendation algorithms (like what is discussed above). Give a unique perspective (with personal insights and anecdotes) supported by academic references to discuss the ethical considerations needed to be considered by the developers during this job. **(20 marks) 1000 words**
- b) In your opinion, should organisations like TikTok and NetFlix have unlimited freedom to using these recommendation algorithms. Please draw on personal examples as well as academic references to support your answer. **(20 marks) 1000 words**
- c) Discuss a solution to the legal and ethical issues that could derive from these recommendation algorithms and the growing influence/ impact that these are having on people’s business and personal lives. Again, draw on personal insights supported by academic references to discuss this. **(20 marks) 1000 words**

2. Press release

“AI has the potential to manipulate our thoughts and actions in ways that we're not even aware of. It's like a super smart hacker who's figured out how to infiltrate the most complex system on the planet: the human mind” (The Economist, 2023).¹ Create a convincing press release to engage the reader (e.g., the public) to think about the positive or negative impact of AI on society. Draw from your own ‘your own Personal Journey in the Age of AI’ and highlight the impact (positive or negative) of AI on you and on society.

Use the template below as the basis for your press release.

¹ The Economist (2023). Yuval Noah Harari argues that AI has hacked the operating system of human civilisation. Available from: [Yuval Noah Harari argues that AI has hacked the operating system of human civilisation \(economist.com\)](https://www.economist.com)

- You must write something under every heading.
- The final document should be between 1 and 2 'A4' pages long.

Below is the template for your press release. Please write something for each of the headings.

Heading—Title your press release in a way the reader (i.e., target audience) will understand.

Sub-Heading—Describe who the story is for and how they benefit.

Summary—Give a summary of your personal experience of AI. Assume the reader will not read anything else so make this paragraph good.

Problem—Describe the current AI situation.

Solution—Describe how you feel AI needs to be continued/ developed.

Quote from You—A quote from you on the experience of AI for you.

Closing and Call to Action—Wrap it up and give pointers to where the reader should go next.

All marks will be allocated according to the clarity and succinctness of your press release and how effectively it communicates your view on the topic. **(40 marks)**

Word count (or equivalent):

4000 words

This is a reflection of the effort required for the assessment. Word counts will normally include any text, tables, calculations, figures, subtitles and citations. Reference lists and contents of appendices are excluded from the word count. Contents of appendices are not usually considered when determining your final assessment grade.

Academic or technical terms explained:

Guidance Notes

- **Part 1 Case Study & Questions**

The collective three answers to these questions must be word-processed and no longer than 3000 words (+/- 10%). You are required to research the appropriate literature, legislation and cite suitable examples where relevant. Appropriate referencing must be used throughout; the 3000-word limit does not include your references.

- **Part 2 Press Release**

The press release must be word-processed and use the template provided. It must be no longer than 1000 words (+/- 10%). The 1000-word limit does not include your references.

- **Planning and Research Support**

Tutors and student coaches will be available to discuss answers to questions and the press release and suggest approaches and there will be time allocated for assignment support during the 6-week block.

- **Marking and Assessment Criteria**

Parts 1&2 are together worth 100% of the total assessment for this module. See the assessment criteria below for more detail.

Submission Details

Submission Deadline:

This will be provided on the Moodle submission point.

Estimated Feedback Return Date

This will normally be 20 working days after initial submission.

Submission Time:

By 4.00pm on the deadline day.

Moodle/Turnitin:

Any assessments submitted after the deadline will not be marked and will be recorded as a non-attempt unless you have had an extension request agreed or have approved mitigating circumstances. See the School Moodle pages for more information on extensions and mitigating circumstances.

File Format:

The assessment must be submitted as a pdf document (save the document as a pdf in your software) and submit through the Turnitin submission point in Moodle.

Your assessment should be titled with your:

**student ID number, module code and assessment ID,
e.g. st12345678 CIS6004 WRIT1**

Feedback

Feedback for the assessment will be provided electronically via Moodle. Feedback will be provided with comments on your strengths and the areas which you can improve. View the [guidance](#) on how to access your feedback.

All marks are provisional and are subject to [quality assurance processes](#) and confirmation at the programme Examination Board.

Assessment Criteria

Learning outcomes assessed

Learning Outcomes
[LO1] Critically consider the wider legal, social, professional and ethical environment for IT professionals.
[LO2] Critically discuss contemporary issues at the intersection of computing, technology, economy, politics and society.
[LO3] Demonstrate appreciation of the importance of a professional and ethical approach to computer science, software engineering and information systems, along with the importance of lifelong professional development.

Assessment Criteria	100%
Task 1 (LO1, LO2, LO3)	60%
Task 2 (LO3)	40%

Marking/Assessment Criteria

Part 1: Case study and Questions	60%
Question a)	20%
Question b)	20%
Question c)	20%
Part 2: Press Release	40%
Heading and Sub-heading	8%
Summary	8%
Problem	8%
Solution	8%
Quote from you	4%
Closing and Call to Action	4%

**Further Information on assessment,
referencing and grading can be found in the
Module Handbook (on Moodle)**

Assignment Project Quiz Exam Essay Help
WeChat: cestbon-6888
Email: accoder-overseas@163.com

Marking/Assessment Criteria

	Case Study & Questions 60%	Press Release 40%
70 – 100% (1st)	Excellent and very convincing answers to the three questions that show evidence of extensive research. A detailed, in-depth and insightful discussion is given that focuses on the relevant issues from the case study. A clear, well-structured presentation of the points and discussion. High quality references used.	A highly creative press release on the topic stimulating some excellent interest and critical thinking. Heading and subheading are clear, and the summary is complete. The problem and solution discussed are very convincing. They both encompass research and excellent depth of knowledge and relevance to topic. An engaging quotation and final call to action. Excellent attention to detail. High quality references used.
60-69% (2:1)	Very good and convincing answers to the three questions that show evidence of some very good research. A detailed and insightful discussion is given that focuses on the relevant issues from the case study. A clear, structured presentation of the points and discussion. Good quality references used.	A creative press release on the topic stimulating some very good interest and critical thinking. Heading and subheading are clear, and the summary is complete. The problem and solution discussed are convincing. They both encompass research and a very good depth of knowledge and relevance to the topic. An engaging quotation and final call to action. Very good attention to detail and quality references used.
50-59% (2:2)	Good answers to the three questions that show some evidence of some good research. A fairly detailed discussion is given that focuses on most of the relevant issues from the case study. A fairly clear, structured presentation of the points and discussion. Some good quality references used.	A fairly creative press release on the topic stimulating some good interest and critical thinking. Heading and subheading are fairly clear, and the summary is almost complete. The problem and solution discussed are fairly convincing. They both encompass some research and a good depth of knowledge and relevance to the topic. A fairly engaging quotation and final call to action. Fairly good attention to detail and some references used.
40-49% (3rd)	Average answers to the three questions that show some evidence of some research. A fairly detailed discussion is given that focuses on	An average press release on the topic stimulating some interest and some thinking.

	most of the relevant issues from the case study. A fairly clear, structured presentation of the points and discussion. A few references used.	Heading and subheading are not fully clear, and the summary is not fully complete. The problem and solution discussed are not very convincing in places. They both encompass little research and some knowledge and relevance to the topic. A quotation and final call to action is partially included. Average attention to detail. A few references used but lacking in quality.
35-39% (Narrow Fail)	A poor set of answers to the three questions that show little evidence of research. No discussion is given that focuses on any of the relevant issues from the case study. Little clarity and structuring of the points and discussion. No references used and little quality.	A poor press release stimulating very little interest and thinking. Heading and subheading are weak, and the summary is not complete. The problem and solution discussed are not effective or convincing. They both encompass very little research and no relevance to the topic. A quotation and final call to action is not included. Little attention to detail. No references used and lacking in quality.
<35% (Fail)	A very poor set of answers to the three questions that show no evidence of research. No discussion is given that focuses on any of the relevant issues from the case study. No clarity and structuring of the points and discussion. No references used.	A very poor press release stimulating no interest and thinking. Heading and subheading are very weak, and the summary is not complete. The problem and solution discussed are not effective or convincing. They both encompass no research and no relevance to the topic. A quotation and final call to action is not included. No attention to detail. No references used and lacking in quality.



Assignment Project Quiz Exam Essay Help
WeChat: cestbon-6888
Email: accoder_overseas@163.com

CardiffMet
MetCaerdydd