First reflection session

When I started thinking about what to do for my reflective project I had lots of different ideas about what would make a good subject. I thought that what I chose had to be controversial and affect a lot of people or it wouldn't be worth writing about. In the end I picked two to discuss with my supervisor. One was about is it right that football clubs charge such high prices for tickets and the other was about if it was right for phishers to trick people into giving them their personal information for things like identity theft. I chose football tickets because me and my dad like to go to the football together, but now it's so expensive we can only go once or twice a season and that doesn't seem fair when we're the ones paying the players wages. I chose phishing because me and my friends were laughing about getting really bad e-mails saying things like 'you have won a lottery, if you send us your bank details we will send you your prize'. Then I started thinking about what if some people, like old people or people who didn't know that these were scams, actually believed it and how bad that would be. This seemed really unethical to me.

I talked about both of these ideas with my supervisor and she said that I needed to form them into a question and we talked about the best way to do that. We also talked about what ethical meant and how it related to both of the subjects that I was thinking about. I thought that both of them had unethical things about them, so I chose phishing because I thought it would be easier to find information for.

Interim reflection

The biggest challenge I have at the moment with the project is finding the time to do it with all my others studies and keeping up with my outside interests. I also broke my wrist playing football and that has really slowed my down because I've had to use voice recognition software rather than typing and it often gets what you say wrong even when you speak really clearly.

It has been pretty easy finding information on phishing. Just by googling it was easy to find a definition of what phishing is that was really clear and I found another website for an anti-virus company that had lots of good statistics to back up my ideas and what I wanted to say. This is important so that the reader can see how big the problem is and take it seriously. I need to start thinking about how I'm going to put my project together and start planning it. In my meeting with my supervisor she made it really clear that it was important to give different perspectives and viewpoint on the subject, so I think a good way to organise the project would be to give the point of view of the victim and then from the point of view of the phisher. This means I could contrast the two different sides and show both points of view, like how the phisher probably doesn't really think what they are doing is wrong even though it really is.

Final reflection – viva voce

I enjoyed doing the reflective project and I think was a good way of helping me look at things from another point view. For example, while for me it was really obvious when I got emails phishing for information because they don't use your real name or they have got mistakes in them, obviously lots of other people don't know about this because lots of people get caught out every year. I thought my conclusion was good too because I gave some examples about what could be done about the

problem of phishing, so I wasn't just being negative about it. I think I also was good at giving my personal point of view and what I thought about it which is important because the project is all about reflecting. My aim at the beginning was to show how big a problem phishing is and to give both sides. I think I did this by the way I organised my project to have a section on phishers, a section on victims and a section on reflections so I could look at both sides, so overall it was quite successful.

I do think I could have done some things better though. When I looked at some other people's projects I realised that my one was quite short so I could have looked at the issue in more detail. Perhaps I could have found someone who had been caught out by phishing and interviewed them. This would have been a good way to show what this impact is because you can say '100,000 people suffered from phishing ', but you don't really know what it felt like, only that it must have been really bad. Maybe I could have also got more types of evidence by doing an interview with the police to find out what they were doing to stop it. I could have then put this in the conclusion to back up my ideas. I think I needed to be more organised because even though I knew there was a deadline and had done quite a lot of notes, I left writing the actual report until quite late. If I had more time I could have written in more detail which would have been better.

Supervisor's comments:

While the candidate showed some initiative in the initial supervisor meeting by providing two possible subjects that they had already given some thought to, the usefulness of the discussion was limited by their interpretation of an ethical *dilemma* as being unethical *behaviour*. When we discussed the need for the ethical dilemma to show different view perspectives on the issue, again this tended to be interpreted largely in terms of victim and perpetrator rather than a more balanced consideration of the positive and negative consequences of an issue that doesn't have a right or wrong answer. Of the two topics suggested, football ticket prices showed greater potential to present an ethical dilemma, so it was a shame that the candidate chose phishing despite being warned that it would offer limited scope to show any ethically justified positive side to it. In the interim interview, they were only able to offer very general justifications for their choice, saying that they thought the subject would be 'more interesting' and 'easier to research'. Inevitably, this had a negative impact on the project as whole as it left the candidate struggling to define what the ethical dilemma relating to the issue actually was , largely limiting him to describing the issue.

The candidate showed relatively little awareness of this as a source of weakness during the final reflection meeting and still showed only a limited understanding of what constitutes an ethical dilemma, despite demonstrating a good understanding of the issue they chose. They were however able to show some ability to reflect on, if not fully evaluate, the research process, particularly in relation to the range of evidence they collected. They were able to suggest some alternative sources of evidence and speak straightforwardly about what these would have added to the project as a whole. With some prompting, there were also able to show a limited understanding of source validity, by recognising that using information from commercial sources such as company websites would not necessarily mean the information is valid and suggesting the possible solution of checking whether other websites gave similar figures.