

CONL701

CRITICAL RESEARCH FOR POSTGRADUATE STUDY

Assessment 3 – Report: The technological singularity

Module title	CONL701 Critical Research for Postgraduate Study
Assessment title	Report: The technological singularity
Module leader	Julie Mayers
Issue date	Week 6
Submission date	Monday Week 9, 13:00 (UK time)
Module learning outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use effective literature search skills 2. Critically analyse relevant material and examine research methodologies 5. Write professional research papers 6. Critically self-assess personal performance
Weighting	65%
Submission instructions	<p>You will work on this assignment individually and submit your IEEE formatted paper as a single Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx) file through Canvas.</p> <p>Upon submission, an automated Turnitin check will be performed and unusually high levels of similarity will be flagged to the marker. By submitting this work, you confirm that you have read, understand and accept the university's regulations regarding plagiarism and agree to be dealt with accordingly if any such situation should arise.</p>

<p>Task details and instructions</p>	<p><u>The 'technological singularity'</u></p> <p>You will probably be aware of growing discussion regarding the so-called Technological Singularity (TS) [1].</p> <p>This is a discussion on which there is widespread debate and disagreement, perhaps largely because there are different concepts of what the TS really is. You are to write a 2,000-word formal academic paper (in IEEE two-column format and referencing style) discussing essential technological features of the TS and the various ways in which different futurists conceive it. You should also discuss the current, emerging and future technologies that may be driving us towards the TS, as well as potential obstacles to prevent it. How much of the current discussion is based on credible research (with clearly explained methodologies) and how much is essentially opinion?</p> <p>You may also find this 'alternative view' useful [2].</p> <p><u>Wider social impact</u></p> <p>Although your paper will have a technological focus, there are wider aspects to consider as well. What will be the social, ethical, moral, legal, political, environmental, demographic and economic impact of the TS happening (or not happening)?</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p>Following this discussion, your paper must offer sensible conclusions in at least three respects, the first two based on the discussion in the main body of the paper, the third being reflective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the most realistic 'working' definition or interpretation of the TS? (Perhaps the clearest, most coherent, or the one on which a majority might agree?) 2. How likely is the TS, as determined in (1), to happen? (Or perhaps, when?) 3. What are the limitations of your own discussions in this paper? What assumptions have you made? What areas have you not considered? (You will have been forced, by the word limit, to omit much discussion; you are not at fault for this but what else should ideally have been included?) <p><u>References</u></p> <p>Your article must be supported by an appropriate reference base (cited list of references in IEEE format) of publicly available and credible sources. References do not count towards the 2,000-word count.</p>
---	---

Late submissions	All required work must be submitted, in full and as directed and described, by the due time and date, to achieve marks reflecting its full worth. Work submitted after the due time and date, but within one calendar week, will be capped at 40%. Work more than a week late will not be marked and will be entered as 0%.
Guidance	<p>A particular challenge of this assignment will be to condense such a broad discussion into 2,000 formal words. This will require careful planning and structuring of your work together with efficient use of academic/scientific language.</p> <p>Note the requirement for <i>both</i> IEEE paper formatting and referencing [3].</p>
Marking criteria	See the attached marking criteria for individual assessment details.
Feedback policy	Individual feedback will be given through Canvas within three weeks of the submission date.
Support arrangements	<p><u>Discussion forum</u></p> <p>You are invited to discuss your ideas and progress with other students in the online discussion forums provided through Canvas.</p> <p><u>Module tutor</u></p> <p>In the first instance, questions should be addressed to your module tutor. You can find their details in the module introduction unit on Canvas. However, although they may, if appropriate, provide general guidance or clarify issues of interpretation or understanding, they are <u>not</u> usually able to give specific or focused advice on questions relating to material within the assignment.</p> <p><u>Module leader</u></p> <p>If you have further questions, you can contact Julie Mayers, the module leader.</p>
Marking and moderation policy	All work is marked by your module tutor and moderated by the module leader to ensure quality and consistency.

References

[1] J. Pandya, *The Troubling Trajectory Of Technological Singularity*, Forbes, Feb. 10, 2019. Accessed on: Dec. 18, 2019. [Online].

Available: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/cognitiveworld/2019/02/10/the-troublingtrajectory-of-technological-singularity/>

[2] V. Grout, "The Singularity Isn't Simple! (However We Look at It) A Random Walk between Science Fiction and Science Fact", *Information*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp.99–116, Apr. 19, 2018. Accessed on: Dec. 18, 2019. [Online].

Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/9/4/99>

[3] IEEE, *Manuscript Templates for Conference Proceedings*, Oct. 2019. Accessed on: Dec.

18, 2019. [Online].

Available: <https://www.ieee.org/conferences/publishing/templates.html>

MARKING CRITERIA

The following table documents indicative marking criteria for this assessment. For the 'article of 2,000 words', a range of +/-10% is tolerated before penalties are applied (1,800 to 2,200 words is acceptable without penalty). References do NOT count towards the word count.

ELEMENT	ASSESSMENT TASK	<40% (R):	40%+ (C):	50%+ (B):	60%+ (B+):	70%+ (A):
Abstract, Introduction, Formatting	Appropriate Abstract and Introduction adhering to the correct formatting.	Insufficient Abstract and Introduction; not adhering to the correct formatting.	A satisfactory Abstract and Introduction; issues with the formatting.	A fairly good relevant Abstract and Introduction; correct formatting.	A very good Abstract and Introduction; correct formatting	A professional academic paper
General technological discussion and critical analysis	General discussion of drivers and obstacles to the TS. Discuss credibility of claims and counterclaims	Insufficient general discussion or insufficient depth. Insufficient or inappropriate critical analysis and evaluation	A satisfactory general discussion, relevant for the most part, with some awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A fairly good, relevant general discussion, with sound awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A very good, relevant general discussion, with complete awareness and strong application of critical analysis and evaluation	A professional, academic treatment of the general topic.
Mediating between conflicting opinions	Considering different arguments and points of view. Seeking balance based on evidence.	No consideration of conflicting opinions.	Limited consideration of conflicting opinions and no mediation.	A fairly good discussion of conflicting opinions but limited mediation.	Sound discussion of conflicting opinions and reasonable mediation	Excellent discussion of conflicting opinions and mediation.
Wider social impact and critical analysis	Consider impact beyond the mere technological: Social, ethical, moral, legal, political, environmental, economic.	Insufficient general discussion or insufficient depth. Insufficient or inappropriate critical analysis and evaluation	A satisfactory general discussion, relevant for the most part, with some awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A fairly good, relevant general discussion, with sound awareness and application of critical analysis and evaluation	A very good, relevant general discussion, with complete awareness and strong application of critical analysis and evaluation	A professional, academic treatment of the general topic.
Conclusions: What is the TS	Logical conclusions to be drawn from the body of the discussion.	Insufficient conclusions or mainly non-sequiturs drawn.	Some appropriate conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn and demonstrated by clear argument	Conclusions are logically complete.
Conclusions: Will the TS happen?	Logical conclusions to be drawn from the body of the discussion.	Insufficient conclusions or mainly non-sequiturs drawn.	Some appropriate conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn	Sound conclusions are drawn and demonstrated by clear argument	Conclusions are logically complete.
Conclusions: Self-reflection	Discuss own performance in terms of work included/not included	Little effective reflection	Some effective reflection	Sound effective reflection	Good effective reflection	Complete and honest effective reflection
Reference base	Provide a suitable set of verifiable sources to support your discussion	Inadequate or inappropriate reference base	Adequate reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 15+ credible references)	Sound reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 20+ credible and varied references)	Good reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 30+ credible and varied references)	Excellent reference base in terms of size and focus. (Informal guide: 40+ credible and varied references)