

# Assignment 3

## Deliverables and Submission Details

**Submission deadline: 30 September 2025, 23:00 (Tuesday)**

The deliverables for this assignment are as follows:

- One docx or PDF file containing your responses to the two tasks as described below; and
- The completed "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report" (also a docx or PDF file).

Templates for the tasks response file and "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report" are available on the INFO4990 / INFO5993 Canvas Assignment 3 description page. You must use these templates to complete this assignment.

Submit your completed files to the appropriate Assignment 3 submission boxes in the Canvas unit site and email them to your supervisor for marking before 30<sup>th</sup> September 2025 (11:00 pm) deadline.

## Introduction

The objectives of this assignment are as follows:

- Further develop skills in finding good research papers that are relevant to your research area;
- Practise writing a literature review;
- Practise writing a detailed outline of your proposed research approach; and
- Further develop your Academic English writing skills.

You need to complete the tasks as described below. You are also required to complete a "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report". Details follow.

## Task 1 (25 marks)

Prepare a **literature review** containing a critical review of the work you have found related to your research topic. Your review needs to **highlight gaps** you have identified in the literature. Organize your review around the questions or claims relevant to your research rather than just listing the papers you have read.

If you are unsure about the expected length of your literature review, a rough guide would be around **4500 words** (a 4500 word text would occupy about 9 pages if a **font size of 12** with **single line spacing** is used); note that a short literature review (that is

only about 2000 words in length) is acceptable only for new research fields where there is very limited relevant prior work; if your research field is well established, your literature review should be much longer. There should also be **at least 15 properly referenced** conference and journal articles and possibly books (it is likely that you will need to cite considerably more work than this suggested minimum).

## Task 2 (10 marks)

Prepare **a report that identifies a research problem** (linked to your literature review above) and **highlights the contributions** you intend to make in your research area. Explain in detail how you plan to evaluate your contributions. You should provide enough detail to show that you have thought about how to convince readers. For example, if you intend to measure performance, you should describe what aspects will be measured and what you will compare the measurements to.

Your report should be about **1000 words in length** (about two pages if a font size of 12 with single line spacing is used).

## Citing and Referencing Sources

You must use an internationally recognized citation/referencing style such as APA or **IEEE referencing** to cite and reference your sources. It is a requirement of this assignment that you cite and reference sources appropriately.

## Policy on Using Automated Writing and Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools

You may use automated writing and/or generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools in this assignment for any reason as long as you comply with the following conditions:

- You will submit a correctly completed "Generative AI and Writing Assistance Tools Usage Report" for each assignment submission (a template is provided in this unit's Canvas site);
- You will use these tools in an ethical manner as required under relevant University policies;
- You will ensure that the work you submit is primarily your own work (you must not submit work that is primarily produced by automated writing tools and/or generative AI);
- You will not use automated writing or generative AI tools to enable, facilitate, or hide collusion with another student or anyone else;

- You will not use these tools to enable, facilitate, or hide any other form of Academic Dishonesty; and
- You must comply with all relevant laws that apply to you (for example, in Australia, it may be illegal for you to transmit copyrighted material to an AI chatbot if you do not own the copyright unless the copyright owner has expressly given you permission to do so).

General information about using and acknowledging generative AI and automated writing tools is available at <https://www.sydney.edu.au/students/academic-integrity/artificial-intelligence.html> and <https://canvas.sydney.edu.au/courses/51655/pages/university-of-sydney-guidelines?wrap=1>. Please note that you must observe the conditions mentioned above this paragraph if you choose to use a generative AI or automated writing tool.

## Peer review workshop

A literature review draft workshop will be held during the lecture in week 5. The purpose of this workshop is for you to obtain feedback on your progress towards completing this assignment. Please have a literature review draft ready for this workshop. Note that this workshop is not worth any marks.

# Rubric

## Task 1

Mark	Criteria
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies relevant research questions;</li> <li>Provides an exemplary in-depth review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li> <li>Judiciously selects papers that represent important work, particularly the "state of the art";</li> <li>Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li> <li>Provides an expert level critical evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li> <li>Consistently applies Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>There are no errors; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
22 – 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies relevant research questions;</li> <li>Provides an excellent in-depth review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li> <li>Judiciously selects papers that represent important work, particularly the "state of the art";</li> <li>Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li> <li>Demonstrates well-developed skills in critically evaluating the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li> <li>Follows Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>There may be isolated minor errors; and</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
19 – 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies relevant research questions;</li> <li>Provides a very good in-depth review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li> <li>Selects papers that represent important work, particularly the "state of the art";</li> <li>Demonstrates a very good understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li> <li>Provides a credible evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li> <li>Most arguments are well developed;</li> <li>Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be infrequent minor lapses in written expression and/or referencing; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
16 – 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies relevant research questions;</li> <li>Provides a good in-depth review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li> <li>Selects papers that represent significant work;</li> <li>Demonstrates a good understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li> <li>Provides an evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li> <li>The evaluation has some credibility but is generally not well developed;</li> <li>Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be some minor lapses in written expression and/or referencing; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>

13 – 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifies relevant research questions;</li><li>• Provides a generally adequate in-depth review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li><li>• Generally selects papers that represent significant work but a small number of selections may be questionable;</li><li>• Demonstrates a generally adequate understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li><li>• Provides a limited evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li><li>• The evaluation has little or no credibility;</li><li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be significant lapses in written expression that do not significantly interfere with intelligibility and/or referencing; and</li><li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li></ul>
10 – 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifies relevant research questions;</li><li>• Provides an extended review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the identified research questions;</li><li>• The review is of variable quality;</li><li>• Selects some papers that represent significant work;</li><li>• Some selections may be questionable;</li><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li><li>• Provides little or no genuine evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li><li>• The evaluation has little or no credibility;</li><li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be significant lapses in written expression that do not significantly interfere with intelligibility and/or referencing; and</li><li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li></ul>

7 – 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research questions may or may not be identified;</li> <li>• Provides a limited review of conference papers, journal papers, and other work that are relevant to the student's research area(s);</li> <li>• The "review" may tend to rely on narrative description rather than analysis or evaluation;</li> <li>• Paper selection may or may not be appropriate;</li> <li>• Demonstrates limited understanding of the research contributions made and research methods used in the reviewed papers;</li> <li>• Provides little or no genuine evaluation of the research literature in terms of how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge that may be useful in tackling the identified research problem and gaps in the existing literature;</li> <li>• Shows some awareness of Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>• There may be some errors that significantly interfere with intelligibility;</li> <li>• Citations and references might be largely incorrect or missing; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
4 – 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research questions may or may not be identified;</li> <li>• Recounts ideas in some conference papers, journal papers, and/or other work that are relevant to the student's research area(s);</li> <li>• Paper selection may or may not be appropriate;</li> <li>• May rely considerably on repeating some phrases or sentences from the papers;</li> <li>• Response might be brief;</li> <li>• Citations and references might be largely incorrect or missing; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response may be short, intelligibility may be affected considerably by poor written expression, and/or attempts to paraphrase are not always successful;</li> <li>• Citations and references might be largely incorrect or missing; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
1 – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes one or more general statements about one or more conference papers, journal papers, and/or other work that are</li> </ul>

	<p>relevant to the student's research area(s) without serious engagement with the question;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper selection may or may not be appropriate;</li> <li>• May rely mostly on repeating some phrases or sentences from the papers;</li> <li>• Response might be very brief;</li> <li>• Citations and references might be largely incorrect or missing; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly fails to convey meaning due to atrocious written expression; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response entirely fails to address question</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response is mostly or entirely a series of generative AI prompts</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response is primarily produced by an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul>

## Task 2

Mark	Criteria
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>• Clearly describes the intended contributions in depth;</li> <li>• Clearly describes a convincing evaluation process in depth;</li> <li>• Presents arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process with flair and originality;</li> <li>• Refers to the research literature judiciously;</li> <li>• Consistently applies Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>• There are no errors; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>• Clearly describes the intended contributions in depth;</li> <li>• Clearly describes a convincing evaluation process in depth;</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents well-developed arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process;</li> <li>• Refers to the research literature when appropriate;</li> <li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>• There may be isolated minor errors; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>• Describes the intended contributions in depth;</li> <li>• Describes a credible evaluation process in depth;</li> <li>• Presents generally well-developed arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process;</li> <li>• Refers to the research literature when appropriate;</li> <li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be infrequent minor errors; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>• Describes the intended contributions in depth;</li> <li>• Describes a evaluation process in detail that has some credibility;</li> <li>• Presents some arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process but they are not generally well-developed;</li> <li>• May refer to the research literature when appropriate;</li> <li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be some minor lapses in written expression; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>• Describes the intended contributions in detail;</li> <li>• Describes a evaluation process in detail that has limited credibility;</li> <li>• Presents some arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process but they are always or almost always not well-developed;</li> <li>• May refer to the research literature when appropriate;</li> <li>• Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be some significant lapses in written expression that do not significantly interfere with intelligibility; and</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>Describes the intended contributions in detail;</li> <li>Describes a evaluation process in detail that has little or no credibility;</li> <li>Presents some arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process but they are always not well-developed;</li> <li>May refer to the research literature when appropriate;</li> <li>Follows Academic English writing conventions but there may be some significant lapses in written expression with isolated lapses that significantly interfere with intelligibility; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May or may not identify a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>Describes some intended contributions;</li> <li>Describes a evaluation process in detail that has little or no credibility;</li> <li>Arguments in support of the proposed evaluation process may be brief or missing;</li> <li>Shows some awareness of Academic English writing conventions;</li> <li>There may be some errors that significantly interfere with intelligibility; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May or may not identify a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> <li>Briefly describes some relevant ideas for the project;</li> <li>Details on the evaluation process may be superficial or missing;</li> <li>The response may be short, intelligibility may be affected considerably by poor written expression, and/or attempts to paraphrase are not always successful; and</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May or may not identify a relevant research problem that is appropriate;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recounts some relevant ideas from the literature that may be relevant for the project;</li> <li>• May rely considerably on repeating some phrases or sentences from the papers;</li> <li>• Response might be brief; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only partially intelligible for most or all of the submitted work due to very poor written expression; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes one or more general statements about an idea from the literature that is relevant to the student's research area(s) without serious engagement with the question;</li> <li>• May rely mostly on repeating some phrases or sentences from the literature;</li> <li>• Response might be very brief; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly fails to convey meaning due to atrocious written expression; and</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response entirely fails to address question</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response is mostly or entirely a series of generative AI prompts</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response is primarily produced by an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul>