

FIT5128/FIT4444/FIT4448 ASSIGNMENT 3: *THESIS*

A. Overview and Deadline

The aim of this assignment is to prepare a **research paper** explaining and justifying the research that you have done. You will be marked on both the quality of research itself and how you have presented it. This assignment is worth **80% of the available marks** for the entire project.¹ **Half the marks available in this assignment (50%) are directly for the research you actually do and your account of the methodology.** The due date for this assignment is:

- For students on FIT5128/ FIT4444/FIT4448 – **Friday 4:30pm, Week 12.**

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 University procedures. **If your assignment is seven or more days late, you will automatically receive a mark of zero.**

Warning: The current position is now that the University will decide most extension applications, rather than the Chief Examiner.³ The criteria are likely to be stricter than in previous semesters, especially if an extension is requested due to a delay in research. This means you should plan on the basis that you expect delays. You should also take steps to minimise the risk of delay, such as by completing ethics applications early, and securing resources (such as High-Performance Computing) in advance of you needing to use them. Furthermore, you should write your thesis in parallel with conducting the research.

B. The Thesis Assignment

You must write a **research paper** of no more than 8000 words *excluding references*. Only the first 8000 words (excluding references) that you submit will be marked – examiners will be **instructed to ignore any additional material beyond this** and mark your research paper accordingly. The full thesis must be in the structure set out in **Section C** of this document. In addition to the research paper, you will submit the following, which will **not be directly assessed or marked** but are available for **reference** by your examiners.

¹ For students undertaking a minor thesis, this is three modules in succession – FIT5126/FIT5127/FIT5128. For students on an honours program, this is normally four connected modules – FIT4441/4442/4443/4444 (or FIT4448 instead of FIT4443 and FIT4444 for an Honours student undertaking an 18-credit point thesis).

² An assignment that is submitted after 4:30pm (Melbourne Time for Australia and Kuala Lumpur based Students) is deemed to have been submitted on the following calendar day. For example, an FIT5126 assignment submitted at 5 pm on Sunday on Week 12 would be deemed to be three days late and have 15 marks deducted, whilst one submitted at 4 pm that same day would be treated as being two days late and have 10 marks deducted. These deductions are made **by the administration**, not by individual markers.

³ The exception to this is that the Chief Examiner has the power to give extensions of up to five calendar days, on an application to them.

- **Part 1:** A copy of your literature review you submitted in earlier in the course ('Assignment 2')
- **Part 3 (optional):** Appendices providing supporting documentation of your research (e.g. code lists, datasets ethics forms, interview transcripts).

This report will be marked by two examiners⁴ in line with 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. Please note that excellent reports (>90% marks) will in substance and quality of argument **resemble a high- quality conference paper** (or a journal article⁵): the venues that we recognise in the Faculty as being 'high quality' can be found in **Annex C** of this document.

C. Structure of Full thesis

Your report is **required** to have the following structure: (*Note: only **Part 2** is being submitted for direct assessment*). **Length Penalties (per Part B) apply to Part 2.**

Preliminary Sections:

- Title Page. *This is a single page containing (i) a title for your thesis, (ii) your student ID number, (iii) your name, (iv) the course you are studying (FIT5128/FIT4444/FIT4448) and (v) your supervisors name. You **must** also include a **word count for Part 2 (excluding references)**.*

- Table of Contents.

(*You **may** also include acknowledgments in the preliminary sections.*)

Part 1: General Literature Review

A copy of your literature review (and proposal) that you submitted in earlier in the course ('Assignment 1').⁶ This section is **not** (re)marked: instead it is made available purely for reference for your markers.

Part 2: The Research Paper

You should prepare a research paper in a format consistent with the structure and style of a Faculty Quality List paper (see **Annex C**). This paper must be no more than 8000 words in length, *excluding references*. Any words over and above this limit will not be marked. There are three additional requirements:

1. You must **not** copy and paste material from Part 1 into Part 2: instead you should write a *fresh and focussed* argument.⁷

⁴ If the assessors are unable to agree on marks that are *less than* 10 marks different to each other, then the assignments may be marked by a third marker. Otherwise, the mark is automatically the average of that awarded by both markers.

⁵ A research paper in the form of a 'journal article' **must** still be in conformity with the **length limitations** set out in these assignment instructions.

⁶ If you are part-time and completed the old format where the literature review and proposal were separate assignments, then please just submit your 'Literature Review'.

⁷ Please note that Monash University policy prohibits self-plagiarism. As you have already been marked on your literature review, resubmitting it for assessment would be in breach of Monash University policy. The same would apply for attempts to copy and paste text from any other assignment into Part 2 of the thesis.

2. You **must** clearly distinguish between the work that you personally did on the project and the work which is that of others.⁸
3. You **must** provide a reference list covering all citations in the substantive text: this should be at the end of Part 2 and given the heading 'References'.

Part 3: Appendices

You **may** provide supporting evidence for the work that you have completed, comprising purely of original supporting documents generated throughout the course of your project. By way of examples, this might include:

- Code listings of computer code that you wrote yourself.
- Example interview transcripts.
- Illustrations of prototypes.
- Datasets.
- Ethics applications.

The sole purpose of these appendices is to give you the opportunity to provide direct evidence to examiners that you have completed the work you have said you have done in the Research Paper. These appendices are **not marked and cannot be used to extend the substantive research paper length over the 8000-word (excluding references) limit**. A more detailed set of examples of potential inclusions is provided in **Annex B** of this document. Please note that an examiner may request further information from you (via the chief examiner), and the expectation is you would be able to provide any such supporting documentation in the event you are asked.⁹

D. Support with this assignment

The idea of this course is that you work closely with your supervisor (or supervisory team). You should be doing your research in partnership with them and meeting with regularly to progress the project. However, the supervisory team will not 'do' your research for you, or write your report, but they might assist, such as by suggesting ideas, critiquing your work and study designs, or making available facilities or existing tools. It is also permitted (and encouraged) to discuss your work with other people (e.g. in solving programming problems), however any such support must be clearly identified in your final thesis.

Your (lead) supervisor is also your first 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 (or they) can contact the Minor Thesis/Honours Lecturer.

⁸ Not giving clear credit for the work of others would be a breach of Monash University's plagiarism policy. As it clear in the public guide (https://www.monash.edu/students/admin/policies/academic-integrity#tabs_2046348), "Plagiarism is taking and using another person's [work or] ideas, or way of expressing them, and passing them off as your own by failing to give appropriate acknowledgement. This includes material sourced from the internet, staff, other students, and published and unpublished works."

⁹ See the Australian Code for or the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018 at R22: "Retain clear, accurate, secure and complete records of all research including research data and primary materials. Where possible and appropriate, allow access and reference to these by interested parties." It is appropriate for all such material to be available to examiners if requested and it is the responsibility of the student to ensure that appropriate access to material is maintained to ensure this can take place.

The drafting of the research report must be your own. Whilst we expect your lead supervisor to provide comments and advice throughout the development and drafting of your research paper, they must **not** edit or draft substantial chunks of text for you to include in your assessed submission.

We will provide additional seminars to support the writing of the research paper.

Finally, please read the rubric (Annex A) 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.¹⁰ 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

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-Thesis.pdf*
2. The submission should be completed in line with the timings set out in **Section A** of this document. Late penalties apply per **Section A** of this document.

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

G. Some Questions and Answers

What is the difference between a research paper and a traditional thesis?

We have introduced this change to the program to reflect the need for there to be a greater emphasis on research and for students to produce reports in a format that are likely to be publishable (perhaps with some changes) after you have submitted your thesis. What you should write is equivalent to reasonable length conference paper (or a short journal article) at a respectable venue. We hope that many projects will be published in the formal academic literature.

What is the difference between a 24cpt thesis and a 18cpt thesis.

The marking criteria are the same, but different weights are given (with more weight being given for the substance of research in a 24cpt thesis). There is also an expectation for more work to have been done, given the increased time available. For the precise standards, please see the Rubric.

Can I have examples of past research papers?

Your supervisory team will be able to identify a number of research papers (i.e. already published papers) that are similar in style and quality of argument to what is expected in this program. See **Annex C** for a list of venues that are recognised as high quality. Leading venues often have associated guidance that they provide to researchers about how to prepare a high-quality submission, which you may also find to be helpful.

¹⁰

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

How long should my research paper be?

Your paper should be as concise as a usual conference research paper in your field, although certain sections involve including slightly more information. The **limit** is 8000 words (excluding references), but this certainly is **not** a target. A lack of focus and concision in your writing is penalised by our marking process (see Criteria 5 in the Rubric, and the general expectation of publishable quality text in Criteria 1, 2 and 4). In practice, it is only interdisciplinary projects and qualitative research studies that we would expect to be close to the 8000-word limit. However, you should also make sure your report is not too short and ensure you have provided all the required details. We would expect that most submissions obtaining high marks will be **at least** 5000 words (excluding references).

Are diagrams and illustrations included in the word counts for the research paper?

No, they are not. After all, diagrams, pictures and illustrations are not words. However, you should be judicious in your choice of diagrams and charts, just as you would be if you were preparing a research paper for submission to a conference or journal.

Why are contributions of the final results ignored in the ‘Substance of Research’ criteria?

Well designed and executed research studies can fail to produce ‘positive’ or ‘statistically significant’ results, without this being the fault of the researcher, especially if the researcher has a limited amount of time to complete a project. What’s more, determining whether or not something is a ‘contribution’ can be a somewhat opinionated exercise which academics sometimes reasonably disagree on: see for example the ‘NIPS experiment’.¹¹ To be fair to the students on the program, the emphasis is therefore on the quality of research design and the extent (and competence) of the implementation of the project. Of course, if you successfully persuade your examiners that you produced positive results based on a rigorous approach, then you would obtain high marks anyway for this criterion. Notably, making an original contribution to knowledge is the standard of a (three/four year) PhD program and is not a requirement of a Minor Thesis or Honours level project. In effect, our approach is to review and assess in line with ‘pre-registered’ studies¹², rather than to emphasise the final results.

Why do I have to resubmit my previous literature review as Part I of this assignment?

This needs to be made available so that the markers can see the wider context when they are assessing the research paper. After all, it is likely that your examiners might not have seen (or marked) your previous assignment: even if they have done so, they will have marked it some time ago.

How long should I expect to spend preparing Appendices?

We expect this will take no more than a few hours for most students. It is simply a matter of cutting and pasting (and possibly shortening) existing material you produced during the course of research, with a few brief additional explanatory notes to explain what the material is.

How will the examiners know which ‘FIT Quality List’ venues that are relevant to this work when applying the marking criteria?

¹¹ <http://blog.mrtz.org/2014/12/15/the-nips-experiment.html>

¹² <https://www.cos.io/our-services/registered-reports>

The reference list you provide in Part 2 will make this clear, as a proportion of the related work will be from those venues. It is worth noting that the difference in writing quality between these types of venues is minimal in any event: the standard is almost uniformly a high one. Your examiners will all be experienced researchers who will have extensive experience of writing and successfully publishing papers at this level of quality. If you prefer to do so, you can also be explicit about a venue that you are targeting in Part 2 of your thesis, but this is optional.

How do I make sure that I am sufficiently clear about the work that I have done and that of others?

The best way to do this is to briefly indicate this in the text. For example, if you developed someone else's software library, you might write '*I expanded [Library X] by [Joe Bloggs] by adding [specific features]*'. If you used someone else's data, then you could say that '*I analysed the [Dataset Name] dataset by [Joe Bloggs], which he has already collected prior to this study*'. If you are unsure what to write, please ask your supervisors. If you prefer you can use footnotes in the relevant places. You can also use the optional acknowledgements section to do this as well, if needed.

How should I format my research paper?

Any consistent format is acceptable. However, we would recommend that you consider adopting a format used for a relevant conference or journal identified in **Annex C**. When preparing figures, you should also be consistent in the use of typeface, colour and so forth with any target venue.

ANNEX A – MARKING RUBRIC FOR RESEARCH PAPER

A1 Overview and Publication Quality Types

This rubric is drafted with respect to different levels of academic publications as a comparator. A full understanding of what is required generally requires substantial experience as an academic and is context-specific: this is why students will normally regularly meet with supervisors to help understand their progress and receive feedback on their drafts before submission. In outline, the following publication standards are applied in this Rubric:

Lightly peer-reviewed / Poster / Work in Progress (D): These works tend to be of the extent of a small pilot study or investigation, albeit executed without any major errors or flaws. The methodology will have the core details, but some high-level decisions taken will be unclear in terms of their justification. The quality of writing will leave some details missing and the argument need not to have much insight or innovation, albeit there will be an accurate interpretation of the (often limited) results in question.

Lower tier / National level conference (Lower HD): These works will be of a more substantial extent than a pilot study, albeit of a scale unlikely to be accepted in a higher-tier conference. The execution may contain a small amount of innovation and the study or investigation will have been executed without any notable errors or substantial flaws. Most of the text will be drafted in a focussed manner, albeit with the occasional infelicity of expression: any missing details will be minor oversights. The argument will have some insight and innovation and there will be an accurate interpretation of the results in question, including in respect of their potential wider implications.

Higher tier / Q1 conference / Q1 Journal (Upper HD): These works will be of a substantial extent and scale, with a substantive amount of innovation, as well as offering a carefully reasoned consideration of all key decisions taken in respect of the design of study or investigation. The text will be drafted in a focussed manner and the arguments advanced will be easy to read and understand, with the points being argued having been carefully selected. The study or investigation will have been executed without any errors or notable deviations from recognised best practice. The work will be described in a manner as to be reproducible, insofar as practicable, with it being clear as to why each decision was taken in the design of the study or investigation. The arguments advanced will be insightful, with there being an accurate interpretation of the results, and an innovative reflection of their wider implications.

Please note that, here we focus on the overall research practice conducted and the presentation quality, **rather than whether results are ‘positive’ or statistically significant.**

A2 Marking Descriptors

This assignment is **marked out of 100**. The rubric should be read with the rest of the assignment instructions, which are also **binding** on examiners. Penalties in respect of the quality of writing (but not argument) can only be applied in respect of criteria 5A and 5B. The marks are apportioned as follows:

Criteria 1A: Abstract and Introduction (5 Marks)

Grade ¹³	Description
N (0%-49%)	There is little or no discernible introduction and abstract.
P (50%-59%)	There is a discernible introduction and abstract, but it is not clear as to what the paper is about or what the proposed contributions are.
C (60%-69%)	There is an introduction and abstract, but it is somewhat unclear as to what the paper is about or what the proposed contributions are. There is an attempt to connect the introduction with the existing literature.
D (70%-79%)	There is a clear introduction and abstract, with a reasonable, if not imperfect attempt to connect the introduction with the existing literature.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	There is a clear introduction and abstract. The introduction is strongly connected with the existing literature. The quality of reasoning and argument is at the level of a work publishable at a lower-tier but reasonable quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	There is a clear introduction and abstract. The introduction is strongly connected with the existing literature. The quality of reasoning and argument is at the level of a work publishable at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

¹³ For honours students taking FIT4444 or FIT4448, the appropriate grade will be given per the University grade descriptor <https://www.monash.edu/exams/results/results-legend>. So, a mark of 80% or above will correspond to a 'HI', a mark of 70-79% would correspond to a 'HIIA' and so on.

Criteria 1B: Background (5 Marks)

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	There is no background section, or this is brief and contains very little literature (e.g. <5 papers). The background section is poorly drafted and argued.
P (50%-59%)	There is a limited background section with some connection to the literature (e.g. 5-10 papers). The background section is poorly drafted and argued. No clear gap is proposed.
C (60%-69%)	There is a background section with some connection to the literature (e.g. 5-10 papers). A gap is proposed, although not fully argued for.
D (70%-79%)	There is a background section with a reasonable connection to the literature (e.g. 11-15 papers or more). A gap is proposed with a reasonable justification, but the argument for it has some obvious and significant limitations.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	There is a focussed and well-argued background section that contains a judicious selection of literature (i.e. all the literature chosen is relevant to the argument being made). The quality of reasoning and argument is at the level of a work publishable at a lower-tier but reasonably quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	There is a focussed and well-argued background section that contains a judicious selection of literature (i.e. all the literature chosen is relevant to the argument being made). The quality of reasoning and argument is at the level of a work publishable at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

Criteria 2: Methodology and Justification (15 Marks if 24cpt or Honours, 20 marks if 18cpt)

NB: The analysis of this criterion takes place as if it were the assessment of a pre-registered study, rather than whether results are 'positive' or statistically significant. The main consideration is whether they have set out a clear plan and justified it.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	There is little or no clear methodology.
P (50%-59%)	There is an account of the method, but little or no argument justifying it. The method is generally unclear.
C (60%-69%)	There is an account of the method and this can be mostly understood, except in respect of small details. There is a limited argument justifying the choice of method.
D (70%-79%)	There is an account of the method that can be fully understood. There is a clear but substantially flawed argument justifying the methodology.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	There is an account of the method that can be fully understood. The quality of the justification of the methodology is at the level of a work publishable at a lower-tier but reasonable quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	There is an account of the method that can be fully understood. The quality of the justification of the methodology is that the level of a work publishable at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

Criteria 3: Substance of Research (40 Marks if 24cpt or Honours, 30 marks if 18cpt)

NB: The analysis of this criterion takes place as if it were the assessment of a pre-registered study, **rather than whether results are 'positive' or statistically significant**. This criterion is assessed on the basis that a 24cpt minor-thesis student normally has 12 weeks to conduct their substantive research. For a 18cpt student, this is assessed on the basis of there being 8 weeks to conduct the substantive research.

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	The research presented is fundamentally flawed and has little or no connection with appropriate research practice.
P (50%-59%)	Whilst the research was mostly competently conducted, the volume of work is greatly limited or trivial.
C (60%-69%)	Whilst the research was mostly competently conducted, the volume of work is too limited to have had a reasonable prospect of a publication (even in a 'non-paper' track of a well-respected conference).
D (70%-79%)	The research was conducted in line with appropriate research practice and without any major flaws. The extent and competence of the research conducted (ignoring contribution of the final results) is equal in substance to that of a typical publication in a (lightly peer-reviewed) 'non-paper' track at a well-respected conference, for example as a 'work in progress' or a 'poster'.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	The research was competently conducted in line with appropriate research practice. The extent and competence of the research conducted (ignoring contribution of the final results) is equal in substance to that of a typical archival publication at a lower-tier but reasonable quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The research was competently conducted in line with appropriate research practice. The extent and competence of the research conducted (ignoring contribution of the final results) is equal in substance to that of a typical archival publication at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

Criteria 4A: Analysis of Results and Discussion (15 Marks)

Grade	Description
N (0%-49%)	There are little or no clear results. The results are not interpreted or discussed.
P (50%-59%)	A limited but unclear set of results is presented. There is a very brief attempt to discuss or interpret the results.
C (60%-69%)	There are some mostly clear results. However, there is only a limited attempt to discuss or interpret the results.
D (70%-79%)	The results are clear. There is a reasonable, but substantially deficient attempt to discuss and interpret the results.
Lower HD (80%-89%)	The results are clear and presented effectively in line with the conventions of an academic paper. There is a reasonable discussion and interpretation of results. The quality of the discussion is at the level of a work publishable at a lower-tier but reasonable quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The results are clear and presented effectively in line with the conventions of an academic paper. There is a strong discussion and interpretation of results. The quality of the discussion is at the level of a work publishable at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

NB: The analysis of this criterion takes place as if it were the assessment of a pre-registered study, rather than whether the final results are 'positive' or statistically significant. As such, this concerns the presentation, analysis and the interpretation/discussion of whatever results that were obtained, rather than marking the results themselves.

Criteria 4B: Ethics/Data Privacy (5 marks)

Grade	Description
0%	There is need for ethics/data privacy, but it is not introduced at all
80%	There is need for ethics/data privacy, it is introduced but not clearly introduced or something is missing.
100%	there is need for ethics/data privacy, it is clearly introduced or there is no need of the ethics and data privacy.

Criteria 5A: 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. The quality of the writing is at the level of a work publishable at a lower-tier but reasonable quality venue (e.g. a national level conference, or a lower ranked journal).
Upper HD (90%-100%)	The research is drafted in a focussed manner which is easy to read and understand. The quality of writing is at the level of a work publishable at a well-recognised venue (e.g. a Q1 journal or conference, or a venue in the Faculty Quality List).

Criteria 5B: General Communication Skills (5 Marks if 24cpt or Honours, 10 marks if 18cpt)

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. - 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>

Annex B: Suggested Content of Appendices

The following is a **non-exhaustive** set of examples of types of research activities and the information that could be provided in the appendices in respect of them. Some projects will involve completing several of these activities, in which case the expected material for each activity may be provided. Appendices may also be provided as separate files external to the thesis document.

Project Example Activity	Examples of Potential Appendices
Collection of research dataset.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any required ethical approval documentation. Data collection protocols. This may include photographs of an experimental setup, or a copy of the questions in a survey (if this was the approach used). The dataset (or an excerpt thereof if the dataset is particularly large).
Computational experiments and/or data analysis.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The computer code that was written by the student. If the code was developed in collaboration with others, the student should highlight the lines and aspects of the code which is their own. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This may include examples of code used to conduct testing (e.g. unit tests) to ensure the software is robust. Experimental protocols and details so that the examiner can see how the experiment was conducted. This might include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the experimental environment (e.g. software user, operating system). A list of external libraries relied upon. Identification of the dataset in question (if the student did not collect it themselves).
Implementation of an interactive system (e.g. game, web application or simulation) or novel/adapted hardware (e.g. Arduino, Embedded hardware).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The computer code that was written by the student. If the code was developed in collaboration with others, the student should highlight the lines and aspects of the code which are their own. Screenshots with brief annotation so that the system can be understood. This may also include an illustration of the hardware, for example by way of captioned photographs.
Qualitative interview study and/or design exercises and subsequent analysis.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical approval documentation. List of pre-prepared questions or other supporting material (e.g. prompts, paper prototypes or other relevant artefacts). Annotated transcripts (or examples thereof) that demonstrate that the qualitative analysis was conducted by an appropriate method (e.g. thematic analysis).