

FIT5210/FIT5126/FIT4441 ASSIGNMENT 1: *LITERATURE REVIEW (AND PROPOSAL)*

A. Overview and Deadline

The aim of this assignment is to prepare a literature review and explore the detailed background of your project so that you can define a focussed research problem. This assignment is the first assessment in both the ‘minor thesis’ stream and for your honours project. It is worth **15% of all the available marks** across the project module(s) that you are studying.¹ The due date for this assignment is:

- For students on FIT5210 – **Friday 3pm, Week 5.**
- For students on FIT5126 or FIT4441 – **Friday 3pm, Week 8.**

Late assignments will have five marks deducted (out of 100 available) for each calendar day² that they are late, unless an extension of time is approved under the applicable Faculty procedures. If your assignment is seven or more days late, then you will automatically be awarded a mark of zero. (Furthermore, if your Interim Presentation³ (a separate assignment due in Week 12) is **submitted late or not at all, then further marks will be administratively deducted, as explained in the Interim Presentation instructions.)**

B. The Assignment

You must write a report of up to 6000 words (plus a reference list) that addresses the following questions:

- A. What is the range of research conducted in the research area?
- B. What does the existing research tell us?
- C. What is the gap in the existing research that motivates the research project?
- D. How do you plan on addressing this gap in your research project?

This report will be marked by **one** assessor⁴. It will be marked following the **rubric** appended to this document in **Annex A**. This **rubric is really important** and you should check you address all the points contained within it when you submit your report.

Warning: If the report you submit is over the 6000-word limit, then any material (asides the reference list) after the 6000-word point will **not** be marked. You will also lose further marks for a lack of concision in your writing, see **Criteria 6A** in the mark-scheme.

¹ For students on the minor thesis program, this is three modules in succession – FIT5126/FIT5127/FIT5128. For students on the honours program, this is four connected modules – FIT4441/4442/4443/4444. For those on the graduate certificate, FIT5210 is the only module you take, but that is a triple module.

² An assignment that is submitted after 3pm (Melbourne Time for Australian based Students, Kuala Lumpur time for students registered at Monash University Malaysia and so on) is deemed to have been submitted on the following calendar day. For example, an FIT5126 assignment submitted at 4pm on Sunday on Week 8 would be deemed to be three days late and have 15 marks deducted, whilst one submitted at 2pm that same day would be treated as being two days late and have 10 marks deducted.

³ This does **not** apply to FIT5210 students.

⁴ The marks will be moderated by the Chief Examiner before they are issued.

C. Structure of Report

Your report is **required** to have the following **structure and section headings** (**suggested** word counts for each in brackets):

Title Page. *This is a single page containing (i) a working title for your project, (ii) your student ID number, (iii) your name, (iv) the course you are studying (FIT5210/FIT5126/FIT4441) and (v) your supervisors name).*

1. Introduction (750 words): *This section presents an overview of your literature review, as well as offering an indication (for your readers) of the structure to follow. It should capture the broader topic and problem. It should also make clear the aims and objectives of the literature review itself (rather than just the proposed project).*

2. Substantive Literature Review (3000 words) ⁵: *This should contain a number of subsections, where different topics of the literature review are explored and discussed in detail. In these sections you are presenting your analysis by connecting and critically commenting upon different pieces of relevant literature. NB: you must have read and should have fully understood each source that you cite.*⁶

3. Summary of the State of the Art (500 words): *You should present a clear 'gap' in the literature based on your substantive literature review. This should be persuasively connected to the project you propose to conduct.*

4. Research Project Plan (1500 words): *Provide a focussed plan explaining what research you plan do to resolve (or at least, help address) the identified 'gap' you found in your literature review. You should be able to persuade your assessors that your plan is appropriate, feasible and realistic.*

5. Conclusion (250 words). *A paragraph summarising your report.*

6. Reference List (unlimited word count): *A list of all the references cited in the above text. This is not a 'Bibliography', so you should limit this to the references you actually cited in the sections identified above.*

Warning: If the report does not have the above set of section headings, it may be returned to you to correct, with the late penalty in Section A applying for each calendar day you spend correcting it.⁷ Please use the above structure and section headings to avoid this situation occurring.

D. Support with this assignment

This assignment is your opportunity to conduct a detailed investigation of the academic literature related to your topic of study. Whilst you are responsible for the assignment, your supervisor will be able to help you identify the most relevant literature and explain how to effectively evaluate it. Provided you give them a reasonable amount of time to do so, your supervisor is expected to provide comments on drafts you share with them,

⁵ The titles of the **subsections** in the Substantive Literature Review are chosen by the student to align with the argument they are making and the literature that they are covering.

⁶ See Paragraph 2.8 of the new Academic Integrity Procedure: https://www.monash.edu/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/2300935/Student-Academic-Integrity-Procedure.pdf

⁷ For example, if a report is returned to you for correction on the 25th of October and you return it before 3pm on the 26th of October, you would lose 5 marks for the assignment.

however they are not allowed to draft substantial chunks of text for you to include in your report.

Your supervisor is also your point of contact if you are unclear about the assignment. If there is any confusion or difficulties that you are unable to resolve with them, then you can contact the Minor Thesis/Honours Co-ordinator.⁸

We will also offer some optional seminars this semester to support this module.

Finally, please read the rubric overleaf in detail.

E. Application for Assessment Adjustments

If you have a relevant disability or health condition, you may be entitled to 'assessment adjustments' under Part 6 of the University Assessment Regime procedure.⁹ The process of applying for these is to first approach the Disability Support Service, and then when they have provided recommendations, please write to the Chief Examiner without delay (reuben.kirkham+projects@monash.edu).

F. Submission of Assignment

Your report must be submitted in a PDF format in Moodle in conformity with the following instructions.

1. The file should be named in the following form: *yourStudentID-yourFirstNameSurname-yourSupervisorName-LitReviewProposal.pdf*
2. The submission should be completed in line with the timings set out in **Section A** of this document. Late penalties apply as explained in that Section.

Please do not leave the submission to the last minute, but allow an appropriate amount of time to upload your completed assignment.

⁸He can be contacted at reuben.kirkham+projects@monash.edu

⁹ https://www.monash.edu/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/2300925/Assessment-Regime-Procedure.pdf

ANNEX A – MARKING RUBRIC

*This assignment is **marked out of 100**. The marks are apportioned as follows:*

Criteria 1: Introduction and Aims (10 Marks)

NB – this is **assessed purely on Section 1** of the report ‘Introduction’ as listed in Section C.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	No statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review. It is mostly unclear what topic the project is investigating.
P (50%-59%)	There is a vague statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review. It is somewhat clear as to the topic being investigated.
C (60%-69%)	There is a reasonably clear statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review, however this has obvious omissions. It is mostly clear as to the topic being investigated in the proposed project, with some indication given as to the project's importance.
D (70%-79%)	There is a clear statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review, with only minor omissions. It is clear as to the topic being investigated in the proposed project, with a clear argument advanced as to the project's importance.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	There is a clear statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review, with no notable omissions. It is fully clear as to the topic being investigated in the proposed project, with a clear argument and mostly persuasive argument advanced as to the project's importance.
Upper HD (90%-100%)	There is a clear statement regarding the aim/s of the literature review, with no omissions. It is fully clear as to the topic being investigated in the proposed project, with a clear argument and persuasive argument advanced as to the project's importance.

Criteria 2: Coverage of research (20 Marks)

NB – this is **assessed purely on Section 2** of the report, namely ‘Substantive Literature Review’ as listed in Section C.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	The sources used are inadequate or inappropriate; the review does not show clear understanding or justification of sources for inclusion in the review.
P (50%-59%)	The sources used may be somewhat inadequate or inappropriate; the review does not always show clear understanding or justification of sources for inclusion in the review. There are at least 10 references integrated into the main argument.
C (60%-69%)	The sources used demonstrate acceptable selection of literature; the review exhibits reasonable interpretation of sources and sources' inclusion in the review is somewhat justified. There are at least 15 references integrated into the main argument.
D (70%-79%)	The sources used demonstrate competent selection of literature; the review exhibits appropriate interpretation of sources and justification for inclusion in the review. There are at least 20 references integrated into the main argument.

Lower HD (80%-89%)	The sources used demonstrate judicious selection of literature; the review exhibits perceptive interpretation of sources and clear justification for inclusion in the review. There are at least 25 references effectively integrated into the main argument.
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The sources used demonstrate judicious selection of literature; the review exhibits perceptive interpretation of sources and clear justification for inclusion in the review. There are at least 30 references effectively integrated into the main argument.

Criteria 3: Analysis of literature (20 Marks)

NB – this is **assessed purely on Section 2 of the report**, namely ‘Substantive Literature Review’ as listed in Section C.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	The discussion of the literature is wholly uncritical and at best describes/summarises it only.
P (50%-59%)	The discussion of the literature acts primarily as a description/summary, rather than a critical evaluation of the sources used.
C (60%-69%)	The discussion of the literature includes some elements of critical evaluation of the sources used.
D (70%-79%)	The discussion of the literature demonstrates the students’ ability both to describe/summarise, and to evaluate the sources used.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	The discussion of the literature demonstrates students’ confident ability not only to describe/summarise, but also to critically evaluate the sources used.
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The discussion of the literature demonstrates students’ confident ability not only to describe/summarise, but also to critically evaluate the sources used, including in a comparative and relative fashion.

Criteria 4: Synthesis of ‘gap’ (10 Marks)

NB – this is **assessed purely on Section 3 of the report**, namely ‘Summary of the State of the Art’ as listed in Section C.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	There is no statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review.
P (50%-59%)	There is a vague statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review.
C (60%-69%)	There is a mostly clear statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review. There is also a connection made to the proposed project (i.e. how the gap will be filled by the proposed research).
D (70%-79%)	There is a clear statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review. There is also a clear connection made to the proposed project (i.e. how the gap will be filled by the proposed research).
Lower HD (80%-89%)	There is a clear statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review. There is also a clear and mostly persuasive connection made to the proposed project (i.e. how the gap will be filled by the proposed research).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	There is a clear statement as to the ‘gap’ in the literature found by completing the literature review. There is also a clear and persuasive connection made to the proposed project (i.e. how the gap will be filled by the proposed research).

Criteria 5: Quality of Research Plan (20 marks)

NB – this is **assessed purely on Section 4 of the report**, namely ‘Plan for your research project’_as listed in Section C.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	There is little evidence of a research plan.
P (50%-59%)	There is a high-level research plan, however this is mostly unclear. There is no attempt to justify any of the decisions made in respect of the research plan.
C (60%-69%)	There is a mostly clear high-level research plan, albeit with some substantial missing details. There is a limited attempt to justify some of the decisions made in respect of the research plan. The justification is at least somewhat connected to the gap identified in the review.
D (70%-79%)	The high-level research plan is clear, with only minor missing details. There is a reasonable attempt to justify most of the decisions taken in the research plan, albeit with substantial limitations. The justification is connected to the gap identified in the review.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	The high-level research plan is fully clear. There is a mostly persuasive justification of the decisions taken in the research plan, with only minor limitations. The justification is clearly connected to the gap identified in the review.
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The high-level research plan is fully clear. There is a persuasive justification of the decisions taken in the research plan, with no notable limitations. The justification is clearly connected to the gap identified in the review.

Criteria 6A: Concision and Focus of Writing (10 Marks)

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	The writing is inappropriate and mostly unclear.
P (50%-59%)	There is a limited and mostly unsuccessful attempt to ensure that the account is focussed.
C (60%-69%)	There is some attempt to ensure that the account is focussed, although there are numerous passages with prolixity and a lack of focus.
D (70%-79%)	There is a reasonable attempt to ensure that the account is focussed, although there are a substantial number of passages with prolixity and a lack of focus.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	The argument is drafted in a focussed manner with only the occasional prolixity or clunky wording.
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The research is drafted in a focussed manner which is easy to read and understand, with no prolixity or clunky wording.

Criteria 6B: General Communication Skills (10 Marks)

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The style and vocabulary used in the writing are not accurate or articulate, and the writing may consist of poorly structured sentences with frequent grammatical errors. - Poor paragraph structure and development (too short or long) and lack of logic detract from the writing; subheadings, if used, do not clarify the writing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The document produced has an unclear format, inappropriate for the scope of the task, and technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline have not been addressed. - The student does not attempt to undertake citing and referencing.
P (50%-59%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The style and vocabulary used in the writing is not accurate or articulate most of time, and the writing, while still able to be followed, may contain some grammatical errors. - Paragraphs are not developed, structured and/or linked logically throughout; if applicable, section headings are not used effectively to clarify the writing. - The document produced has some attempt at formatting, though not entirely appropriate for the scope of the task; the student neglects most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline. - The student has attempted to undertake citing and referencing with frequent errors.
C (60%-69%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The style and vocabulary used in the writing is often not accurate or articulate, while the writing consists in the main of clearly structured sentences with few to no grammatical errors. - The writing consists of a set of mostly well composed paragraphs that are in most cases linked logically throughout; if applicable, subheadings are used mostly effectively to clarify the writing. - The document produced has a readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student observes some technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline. - The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some errors.
D (70%-79%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The style and vocabulary used in the writing are generally accurate and articulate, and the writing consists of clearly structured sentences without noteworthy grammatical errors. - The writing consists of a set of well composed paragraphs that are linked logically, and if applicable, subheadings are used effectively to clarify the writing. - The document produced has a clearly readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student observes most technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline. - The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing, with some minor errors.
HD (80%-100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The style and vocabulary used in the writing are consistently accurate and articulate, and the writing consists of clearly structured sentences with no grammatical errors. - The writing consists of a set of very well composed paragraphs that are linked logically throughout, and if applicable, subheadings are used effectively and accurately to clarify the writing. - The document produced has a clearly readable format appropriate for the scope of the task, and the student observes technical requirements required by the faculty and/or the discipline. - The student follows the requirements for citing and referencing. <p><i>NB – for marks within this range, a perfect piece of work would obtain 10 marks, with deductions made as appropriate up and until the point three or more of the above descriptors fall at the D level, or some of them fall at the C level.</i></p>