MIED4020 Examiners' guide

Spring 2023

Master exam assignment

Research methods 2.

Exam Topic**:** Create a research proposal on the topic of '**Artificial Intelligence in Education'**.

The students were asked to write a research proposal on the theme of Artificial intelligence in Education. The students are expected to choose a relevant topic connected to artificial intelligence (e.g., AI and assessment, AI and ethics, and AI and student support, among others). The students are expected to utilise knowledge from the previous courses, such as MIED4010 and MIED4020, to write a coherent proposal containing all the key requirements (e.g. description of the problem, research questions, literature review, conceptual framework, research design, data collection and analysis approaches) that are suitable with the chosen topics. Students are also expected to make reference to relevant course literature, such as Bryman (2015), to help them justify the theoretical and methodological decisions taken.

Detailed Task Requirements

1. **Introduction**
    - Clearly defines the research problem and research questions
    - Demonstrates the relevance and significance of the research project
2. **Literature Review**
    - Provides a comprehensive and up-to-date review of the relevant literature (atleast 5 studies)
    - Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the current state of knowledge and gaps in the field
    - Shows how the proposed research project contributes to the existing literature and gaps
3. **Conceptual Framework**
    - Describes a relevant theory or conceptual framework to guide the study
    - Clearly justifies how the suggested framework is connected to the research problem/questions and how it will aid the analysis
4. **Research Methodology**
    - Describes the proposed research design
    - Shows how the proposed design is appropriate for addressing the research questions
5. **Data Collection and Analysis**
    - Describes the data collection and analysis methods in detail
    - Justifies the choice of methods and provides a clear rationale
    - Shows how the methods are appropriate for addressing the research questions
6. **Ethical Considerations, reliability and validity concerns**
    - Describes the ethical considerations
    - Shows how the ethical considerations will be addressed in the research design
    - Demonstrates an understanding of the way reliability and validity issues will be handled in the research
7. **References and word count**
    - Consistently use APA 6th or 7th edition in-text and the main bibliography
    - All literature is listed alphabetically in the References section, and there must be full consistency between the literature used in the study and what is listed in the literature list.
    - Word count: 2000-3000 words 12-point font, 1.5 spacing.

Assessment Criteria:

- **Candidate receiving (A)**
  - Meets all the criteria and exceeds expectations
  - Shows exceptional depth and insight in the research proposal
  - Demonstrate excellent understanding of the concepts and theories and/or lines of historical developmeargumentsare discussing, and be able to use concepts and argument from the literature productively in the proposal
- **Candidate receiving (B)**
  - Meets most of the criteria and exceeds expectations in some areas
  - Shows good depth and insight in the research proposal
  - Demonstrate good understanding of the most important concepts and/or theories of relevance to the proposed study
- **Candidate receiving (C)**
  - Meets most of the criteria and meets expectations in some areas
  - Shows adequate depth and insight in the research proposal
- **Candidate receiving (D)**
  - Does not meet most of the criteria and meets expectations in few areas
  - Shows limited depth and insight in the research proposal
- **Candidate receiving (E)**
  - Does not meet most of the criteria and meets expectations in very few areas
  - Shows very limited depth and insight in the research proposal
- **Candidate receiving (F)**
  - Does not meet the criteria and meet expectations
  - Shows insufficient depth and insight in the research proposal.