PSYCHOLOGY (BHP315116)

The report for the 2017 examination will provide feedback for candidates about performance on this exam in relation to examiners’ expectations of material covered and criteria addressed. For future candidates it is recommended that this report for external assessment is read in conjunction with previous syllabus reports and examination papers of 2012–2016, available on the TASC website.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In all sections of the examination, candidates scoring in the top range:

- plan, directly address and fully answer the questions asked
- respond to the specific criteria and relevant standards
- demonstrate a thorough knowledge of related concepts and / perspectives and / everyday examples to explain their understanding and application of theory
- analyse and evaluate stimulus materials, relevant human research / empirical evidence as well as classic studies.

A variety of formats for answers was used, including essays, using Part a) and Part b) structure of the questions, and combined longer responses. Many responses appeared formulaic, following the same pattern with a disregard of question specifics.

Time management and planning must be a priority to achieve the best answer. Planning of responses during Reading time would result in well organised, higher quality responses to ensure inclusion of appropriate theories and appropriate empirical evidence.

Candidates need to be made aware that some exam questions may have more than one component and answering all parts of a question will better evidence knowledge and understanding of topics.

Candidates are expected to give definitions of the psychological meanings of concepts rather than definitions from a general dictionary.

Markers found it harder to read responses

- where spelling was poor
- which were written in pencil and red biro
- which had no paragraphs.
SECTION A – PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

QUESTION 1 – VISUAL PERCEPTION

Displaying strong knowledge is important, but it needs to be directed by the question itself.

A number of candidates had not planned before starting to write. Some clearly wanting to include definitions to address Criterion 2 but did not adequately answer the question. Some encouragement and/or focus upon planning/structure at the teaching stage would be appropriate.

The better responses had a clear structure and a plan that focussed upon Visual Perception. These responses coherently explained the process from both a sensation (biological) and psychological progression, with a connection to the questions and stimulus material. Utilising the stimulus wisely and evaluating the theoretical perspectives – Bottom Up / Top Down and Neisser’s synthesis model, was effective.

CRITERION 2 - ANALYSE PERSPECTIVES ABOUT PSYCHOBIOLOGICAL PROCESSES

- Stronger responses were able to adequately explain the process of perception from reception through to interpretation in detail without an overemphasis on sensation.
- Generally terms were explained well, with some slight confusion for some between perceptual principles/perceptual set.
- Some candidates discussed Gestalt Principles when the question asked initially for an explanation of perceptual principles – as if they were the same term; be mindful of the nuances of these two terms.
- There was effective use of Bottom Up and Top Down theories. Candidates are encouraged to examine Neisser’s theory, especially as an evaluation tool.
- Candidates struggled to integrate a discussion of attention and the role of attention into their analysis, and many found it hard to address the physiological impacts on perception. Stronger responses included at least a brief description of this.
- Many responses involved a description of bottom-up and top-down processing, linking the theories of processing to the organisation and interpretation of concepts of perception thus creating a more successful answer.

CRITERION 7 - USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

- Candidates are encouraged to work on using a wide range of empirical evidence for this section and to use more than the provided stimuli as evidence.
- Many candidates were able to effectively use the stimulus but did not follow up by introducing and/or using relevant empirical and textual evidence.
- General “quotes” from Grivas text should not be perceived as empirical evidence.
- Strong responses used the stimuli effectively and were able to connect this to other evidences - for example Stimulus 1 and its discussion on culture.
- Everyday textual evidences were used effectively but candidates need to understand that for strong responses there needs to be links to empirical evidence and research findings.
- It was a concern some candidates did not use any research evidence beyond the question at all in their work.
QUESTION 2--CONSCIOUSNESS

Candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully. Many candidates simply listed the concepts asked for without addressing how sleep can be distinguished from NWC.

Many candidates covered question Part a) and Part b) separately as a means of dealing with the extensive nature of the tasks required within this question. Stronger responses were written in essay format, beginning with a clear psychological definition of Consciousness and incorporating both Parts a) and b) of the question as a logical and well-reasoned point of view supported with a wide range of evidence and evaluations. Weaker responses only managed to address one part of the question with little research and no evaluation and struggled to incorporate the stimuli into the question or only described the stimuli.

The stronger responses were able to incorporate a range of evidence and offer an evaluation.

Candidates are reminded to refrain from relying on rote learnt responses that, whilst containing some empirical evidence, do not fully address the question.

CRITERION 2 - ANALYSE PERSPECTIVES ABOUT PSYCHOBIOLOGICAL PROCESSES

• Candidates were generally well prepared for Part a) of this question with many able to name at least three dream theories and offer some evaluation of the strengths and/or limitations of each.

• Stronger responses included empirical evidence in support of the dream theories and incorporated Stimulus 2 into their argument.

• Candidates are reminded that referring to dream theorists (such as Jung) at the exclusion of those contained in the Psychology course document is not recommended.

• Part b) of the question was not as well answered. Stronger responses offered in-depth explanations of the characteristics of each sleep stage as well as methods used to establish levels of alertness such as GSR, EOG, EEG, EMG and their relevance to sleep.

• Stronger candidates were able to explain how sleep deprivation might manifest itself when REM and NREM sleep are compromised, by using the hypnogram stimulus piece provided. Candidates who did discuss total and partial sleep deprivation were also able to offer some research evidence and real life examples to support their response.

• Many candidates incorrectly describe ASC as the opposite to NWC.

• Some candidates described at length selective and divided attention, NWC and ASC, automatic vs controlled processes, meditation and daydreaming. Candidates need to be reminded that the focus of the Consciousness exam question is sleep.

• Candidates should not combine sleep theories with dream theories.

CRITERION 7 - USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

• Candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully. Many candidates listed the concepts asked for without addressing how sleep can be distinguished from NWC.

• Candidates are reminded that it is important to explain what happens during each sleep stage and fully explain brain wave patterns applicable to each stage, remembering to include the meaning of amplitude and frequency as well as theta, delta etc. illustrations of the differences between NWC and ASC. Stronger responses could compare NREM and REM and draw valid conclusions from the stimuli.
• Candidates who included evidence for characteristics such as attention, time orientation and changes in self-control were rewarded.

• Stronger responses acknowledged Stimulus 1 provided a hypnogram of a normal night’s sleep, (not an EEG recording) and were able to explain the sleep stages and sleep cycle, including for example, time spent in NREM versus REM sleep.

• The link between evidence and psychological concepts is important with stronger responses able to incorporate a range of evidence after defining concepts and prior to offering an evaluation.

SECTION B– REMEMBERING

QUERY 3 – MEMORY

Many candidates answered this question as an essay or as one answer. Candidates wrote long introductions, which added little to their assessment.

Almost all candidates did refer to both stimuli in their responses, and referred to two models of memory as well as attempting to explain the specified terms mentioned.

Candidates need to address criteria deliberately and be clear about what is essential to address the question, especially where evaluation and evidence are required. Candidates are reminded that a thorough response will always analyse and evaluate the theories/models; which ideally means comparing them to one another in terms of similarities/differences, and evaluating the strengths and limitations of each.

CRITERION 4 – ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT REMEMBERING

• While almost all responses outlined/described two models of memory, only a minority of responses actually analysed and evaluated the models

• Most candidates used stimulus 1 to describe the Atkinson-Shiffrin MSM of memory with stronger responses going further; explaining how / why or using evidence

• Most candidates used stimulus 2 to explain how memory can be inaccurate; stronger responses were able to elaborate on this and link it to an explanation of the processes of memory, demonstrating their ability to analyse this stimulus

• Many candidates discussed Baddeley and Hitch’s WMM with a satisfactory level of detail; Craik and Lockhart’s Levels of Processing was cited but in general was not adequately explained

• Some candidates discussed types of LTM and Collins and Quillian’s Semantic Network Theory as a theory, whereas others used it as evidence in relation to other theories or concepts

• Stronger responses described and evaluated each model, but with limited evidence which would have allowed further evaluation.

• Most candidate understood the difference between elaborate and maintenance rehearsal

• Some candidates included diagrams, which worked well when an explanation was included
CRITERION 7 - USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

- Candidates were able to use evidence in the way of explaining the stimuli, referring to two models of memory and in some cases providing examples. However, overall there was a pronounced lack of evidence (other than that provided by the question) used in candidates’ responses. Candidates should be reminded that providing examples is an excellent way of showing understanding as well as providing a form of evidence or support for the concept being described.

- Stronger responses referred to the case study of H.M., the serial position effect, Sperling’s and other research regarding sensory memory, Miller’s ‘magic 7’ and chunking as well as Peterson and Peterson regarding capacity and duration of STM, and Elizabeth Loftus’ studies around false memories and memory alteration. Some discussed the neurological processes involved in memory formation and retrieval.

- There was some good use of Loftus and Palmer from stimulus 2. Stronger responses analysed what this evidence showed and some provided other evidence on false memory as well.

QUESTION 4 – FORGETTING

CRITERION 4 - ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT REMEMBERING

- Strong responses were able to answer Part a) and Part b) separately OR in one essay-responses. Typical of these efforts was a clever addressing of the question and key language used within it.

- A majority of candidates responded through the perspective of organic Vs non-organic causes of forgetting, which was not necessarily the most effective approach, given the nature of the question.

- Many candidates were able to explain at least 3 theories of forgetting well, however, did not include any empirical evidence or often did not include any analysis of these theories.

- Further, weak connections were made between Stimulus 1 and theories of Forgetting. Candidates that did better in this respect were able to highlight Displacement theory, whilst elaborating on Serial Position Effect.

- A number of candidates confused the components of theories. For example when describing Retrieval Failure they also included state dependent and context dependent cues as part of the theory and some discussed proactive and retroactive interference as part of Motivated forgetting.

- Most candidates briefly defined mnemonic devices but did not go on to list or explain them. Many used chunking as a mnemonic device as well as elaboration and consolidation instead of explaining these are techniques used by the mnemonic devices of Acronyms, Narrative Chaining etc. Stronger responses included information from stimulus 2 into the explanation of mnemonic devices.

CRITERION 7 - USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

- Empirical evidence and manipulation of the stimulus was relatively weak. Those candidates who did well included a piece of empirical evidence for each of the theories used to explain forgetting. Typical of these efforts was a clever addressing of the question and key language used within it.

- Candidates did not address both stimuli, but many candidates did refer to stimulus 1. However, many of these drew an incorrect correlation between Stimulus 1 and Ebbinghaus’ forgetting curve.

- Stronger candidates were able to weave stimulus 2 into their explanation of mnemonic devices.

- Most candidates made attempts at answering all three dot points, elaboration, organisation and consolidation and did well in answering the question considering the stimulus was not conducive.
SECTION C – HUMAN LEARNING

QUESTION 5 – CONDITIONING

Responses were structured to answer the question on Conditioning by drawing accurate links to the stimuli, the concepts in the question and other relevant evidence.

The majority of responses identified Stimulus 1 as Classical Conditioning, specifically drawing on neutral, unconditioned and conditioned stimuli as concepts.

Connections were made to how behaviour can be modified through aversion therapy and other types of treatment. Stimulus 2 was identified as an example of a token economy in Operant Conditioning, and the role of reinforcement was linked to shaping behaviour. Some responses were a little confused about shaping and aversion therapy, and these were defined or placed inaccurately.

Some responses included concepts such as types of reinforcement and punishment and/or schedules of reinforcement in detail, but did not consider how this related to the question or stimulus items.

The process of evaluation was often not demonstrated and candidates cited numerous animal studies as examples for Classical and Operant Conditioning when the focus was to explain human learning preferably with human examples.

CRITERION 3– ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT HUMAN LEARNING

- Stronger responses compared the two types of conditioning to each other and often to other types of learning. In particular, the passive/active role of the learner, and key processes such as acquisition, extinction, stimulus generalisation and discrimination were considered.

- Some responses included discussion of how Classical and Operant Conditioning can work together, applying this to the stimuli. Some included strengths and/or weaknesses of theories but many omitted to include this evaluation.

- Stronger responses addressed shaping and aversion therapy and addressed the concepts with adequate examples.

- Stronger responses were able to select the most relevant aspects of the theory of Classical Conditioning to inform their discussion.

- Operant Conditioning did not get the same amount of explanation or evidence to support ideas.

- Many responses were able to link Stimulus 2 and token economies.

- Stronger responses described theories of human learning providing good analyses and evaluation of theories.

CRITERION 7 – USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

- Stronger responses made brief reference to animal studies (typically Pavlov, Skinner, and Thorndike) and used a range of evidence in human conditioning to support ideas. This evidence included Watson and Rayner’s Little Albert, Allen (1964) shy girl, Hall’s eye blink response, and Peter and the rabbit (Jones). Token economies were often supported by research (Ali and Azrin boys’ home), and examples such as gambling and frequent flyer points. Primary and secondary reinforcement was identified in some responses.
• Many candidates thought carefully about what evidence to use and how to support the connections they made between the stimuli, concepts and theories. This was seen in relating aversion therapy to other types of treatment, such as flooding and systematic desensitisation. Examples of aversion therapy included nail biting and bed wetting. Stronger responses added empirical evidence to aversion therapy, such as research into treating alcoholics (Wien and Menustick), the use of Antabuse by Forrest, and ‘treatment’ of homosexuals by Alichin.

• Weaker responses retold the material in both stimuli without any supporting evidence.

QUESTION 6 – OBSERVATIONAL AND SOCIAL COGNITIVE LEARNING

Candidates are reminded that if choosing this question as opposed to Conditioning it is imperative to include other types of Social Cognitive Learning beyond Observational learning and Bandura’s Bobo Doll study.

Essay format answers were the stronger responses, coherently argued, and tended to be less formulaic.

CRITERION 3 - ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT HUMAN LEARNING

• Definitions of learning, observational learning, cognitive learning were a good starting point

• Stronger responses included a critical evaluation of each of the theories of observational and cognitive learning, with many also including insight learning and the learning versus performance distinction.

• Candidates were able to describe Bandura’s study but only made vague reference to latent learning, transfer of learning and cognitive maps as the question required.

• Stronger responses incorporated concepts such as characteristics of models and types of models, vicarious reinforcement and punishment and positive/negative transfer of learning in ways which showed understanding of learning theories and processes.

CRITERION 7 - USE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

• Some strong responses compared behaviourist and cognitive theories and attempted to include criticisms of social cognitive learning.

• Both stimuli involved Observational Learning. Stronger responses were able to define, describe and give human examples of all three types of social cognitive learning asked for, as well as incorporate human examples rather than present only a single sentence explanation of each concept.

• Many candidates described the process of Observational Learning presented in Stimulus 1 but did not expand by giving explanations of each step of the process and application to another human example such as the Suzuki Method. When referring to the stimulus pieces it is important not to simply repeat what is already presented.

• Extensive and descriptive recounting of Bandura’s experiments without making connections to the relevance of later studies (such as Johnson’s study on TV violence) limited the value of this as evidence.

• Candidates who included a wide range of empirical/ real-life evidence that went beyond animal studies were rewarded.
INVESTIGATION PROJECT 2017

INVESTIGATION PROJECT: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Generally there was a broad range of topics chosen that related to individual differences.

- Most candidates made a pleasing effort to choose topics that would allow them to show limited individual differences within their chosen topic.

- Stronger responses explained the issues and used sound theories to explain the possibilities. These then linked to the actual topic being investigated and in the discussion returned to Nature—Nurture (N/N) and studies to make sense of what had been found.

However, some candidates did not address the Nature- Nurture aspect which was the basis of gender, IQ or personality for the IP and many topics this year, skirted too closely around reconceptualised topics for previous modules, particularly those relating to Remembering and Psychobiological Processes.

- Some candidates chose topics that were more sociological than psychological, with many resorting to survey investigations outlining gender division within family chores, the work place, participant selection and sporting/gender stereotypes, without any extensive commentary / application of relevant psychological theory. While clearly drawing to an ‘environmental’ perspective, the absence of any discussion of Nature versus Nurture and relevant concepts and theory within the Individual Differences module, was a concern.

On a cautionary note, there were a few topics selected for investigation which clearly placed candidates in a questionable area. Teachers need to exercise strong discretionary governance, when negotiating topic selection with their students, mindful of the task guidelines, their lack of knowledge within the discipline and their limited skill in the research of complex and sensitive areas of behaviour.

- Ethical concerns are still occurring and candidate names, school / colleges are still appearing on Investigation Projects contravening confidentiality.

CRITERION 1- ANALYSE THEORIES ABOUT INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Many candidates addressed the topic deliberately, applying the following from the guidelines:

This year the module was INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES. The focus of your investigation must reflect the factors that make a person an individual and provide evidence of the biological, environmental and interactionist influences. Both sides of the argument were considered as well as the interactionist view, by providing secondary sources and constructing a primary research relevant to this.

Strong responses explained the issues and used sound theories to support the possibilities.

Some students made no mention of N/N, comparing males and females on some aspect such as memory, or subject choices without any discussion of how these differences may have come about. It is important that students examine an issue using a psychological perspective on the issue of, for example, Gender. Quite a few gender folios had tenuous links to the course and tended to be very sociological in their approach focusing on issues such as inequality resulting from subject selection at school or the impact of gender stereotypes on gender differences in behaviour. There need to be a clear link to environmental processes and psychological theories related to learning.

Secondary research which often considered more than one side of the argument, was often impressive. Stronger folios had evidence of wide reading in the topic, looking at academic sources (such as journal articles), and finding the most relevant and recent explanations and research for the aim and hypothesis. Discussions then reconnected with these ideas, and compared results to previous findings. Long and detailed descriptions of studies did not enhance arguments effectively.
Given the vast number of research studies easily accessible on the internet there is little reason for any student not to be able to find and include references to specific studies related to their area of research.

**CRITERION 6 - USE ETHICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH METHODS**

Teachers are reminded that they must explicitly approve all experiments and studies before they are carried out and that these experiments must meet ethical standards.

It is important to demonstrate how ethical considerations were addressed when conducting research. Candidates need to clearly explain ethics and justify their design in this criterion.

Most candidates selected a research method that was appropriate to their hypothesis, and the Research Design and Method section of the report was set out clearly. It was important that the hypothesis being tested was effectively addressed by the research design and a clear understanding of psychological research methodology was thus demonstrated. Strong responses made a clear link between their hypothesis and the methodology chosen. Some incorrectly referred to their primary research as an experiment when they created a survey.

Many candidates used a survey as their tool for primary data collection. However, most failed to explain how their instrument was created, especially how survey questions were designed.

The majority of candidates were careful to address the folio guidelines for this section, accurately identifying the independent and dependent variables. Ethics was often covered comprehensively, however stronger candidates had thought carefully about how ethical considerations apply specifically to their research (e.g., use of deception and debriefing).

Of concern in some responses, was the opinion that because ‘participants had been informed that there were student counsellors’ or ‘Pulse’ or ‘Life line’ etc. which could be accessed, ethics relating to ‘lasting harm’ of participants, was no longer a concern.

A detailed and clearly structured methodology could also have addressed ethical considerations effectively, however, where younger children were involved there was often not enough explanation of the need for parental consent or working with children indemnity.

A concerning number of students had quite a large methodology section. There seemed an excessive use of explanations in some, especially in comparison to the other sections of the report. Even though there is no word count here, candidates still need to be mindful of length. Some discussed ethics extensively but did not submit a consent form and/or brief/debrief in appendix. Many claimed participants were randomly selected, or obtained by convenience and stratified sampling, yet gave no explanation as to how this was done. The number of participants used in some reports was very low.

Successful responses included graphs that had data that had been manipulated or at least considered - such as averages and percentages - this demonstrated an understanding of the data and its application to the hypothesis far better than including raw data or totals of data in graphs. Only one graph / table was necessary, but it did need to be explained and referred to. Interpretation of the data in the graphs is needed to have a successful discussion of the results. There was also a tendency for reports to include raw data in their results section, in graphical form. Individual participant data can be included in an appendix and still referred to in the discussion of the report. The results section should show the specific results relevant to the hypothesis tested. Often graphs were chosen by candidates as a tool to record their results when a table would have been a more suitable choice. Pie charts with no data (%) continue to be used; candidates continue to use percentages and averages interchangeably and incorrectly, and often inserted raw data in the wrong columns when using Excel, resulting in strangely configured graphs. Some candidates did not include a description under their figures, expecting the marker to do the interpretation and labels on figures need to be more accurate instead of using generalised terms.

Stronger responses demonstrated accurate analysis of data, used correct terminology (for example, too many candidates still use the term ‘correlation’, despite not completing a mathematical correlative equation), had linked
the results to the psychological determinants of difference, demonstrating knowledge of the key concepts and relevant theory and the relational nature of the individual to genetic make-up and environment.

Candidates needed to briefly touch upon the strengths and limitations of their research design in their discussion. Polished IPs identified quantitatively, the strength and shortcoming of their data confidently and accurately. The highest-rating responses noted that the design of the study limited the ability to which results could be clearly interpreted as ‘causal’, using terms such as ‘corresponding links’, ‘supporting evidence’, ‘positive associations’, rather than ‘proved’ or ‘conclusively demonstrate correlations between…’, and drew balanced conclusions about the role of primary and secondary research appraisals.

There was a reasonably heavy reliance on “online intelligence tests” as research tools without suitable time spent discussing the validity and reliability of these as an accurate indicator of intelligence in their discussion of the limitations of their research.

**CRITERION 8 - COMMUNICATE PSYCHOLOGICAL IDEAS, INFORMATION, OPINIONS, ARGUMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS.**

The majority of candidates were able to follow the IP guidelines very well for the structure and format of the report. The word count was generally adhered to but there were a number of reports that did not exceed the 800 - 900 word count, instead of aiming for the maximum 1200 words.

Research conducted by candidates was more effective when the link between research and the report was clear, and added to the discussion. The most successful reports included references to research that provided evidence on the topic and theory being explored by the report.

Again Referencing remains quite problematic with many candidates finding it difficult to accurately reference sources utilised in the study. Frequently the sources cited did not accurately reflect those listed in the Reference section. Similarly many candidates listed a range of sources in their Reference List that were not cited in the body of their folio. These two areas should match.

The principles of identifying sources by author and year in in-text citations, which match identically to the full referencing details in the reference list seems to be lost on the majority of candidates. It was hard to identify sources as candidates had omitted important information such as journal title, name of author, or year of publication. Referencing was often inconsistent, and sometimes duplicated (eg a journal article found on the internet was listed twice under Journal Articles and Websites). Many candidates do not seem to understand the difference between books, journal articles, and websites. Psychological research is built on previous research, and understanding and acknowledging relevant sources is the foundation of a research report.

Not all candidates acknowledged the source of their research instrument and any images they used for their research. This often detracted from their research, as it is imperative to know what the research instrument is. Many candidates were using standard online tests, or research instruments developed by others. It is relevant for the reader to know if the research instrument was designed by the candidate, or where it was sourced. Research instruments and images should be included in an Appendix with an acknowledgement of the source (author and year) underneath, and the full reference in the reference list.

Direct quotations must be acknowledged appropriately and not doing so constitutes plagiarism.

Some candidates struggled to find a variety of sources, instead of just online articles. Further, students need to consider the value of various sources - for example Wikipedia or non-psychological dictionaries - and attempt to utilise more academic and psychology-specific sources instead.

The balance between the Introduction and Discussion sections remains an area upon which to focus; there is either too lengthy a coverage of information in the Introduction at the expense of a rigorous analyse of data in the Discussion, or vice versa.
Strong contributions extended a sophisticated and coherent analysis of data through links to existing empirical background secondary resources, thereby establishing some sense of credible investigative outcome. Most methodology sections were appropriately written in past tense but not all. There is no need to include in the Method section where the primary and secondary sources were obtain from. Survey questions need to be included in the appendix to show a clearer picture of the tool used.

There was a tendency for reports to include raw data in their Results section, in graphical form. Individual participant data can be included in an appendix and still be referred to in the discussion of the report. The Results section should show the specific results relevant to the hypothesis tested. The highest-rating responses evaluated the data thoroughly, noting that the single determining measure (heredity or environment) did not influence causal relationships, as well as identifying when/where primary and secondary appraisals were confounded, and how these affected the validity of the overall research outcomes.

Weaker contributions fell well short of the minimum word length, failed to integrate references in their discussion of data trends, made in-text referencing errors, demonstrated minimal self-editing and critical proof reading, had a noticeable disconnect in quality between the Introduction and remaining sections and failed to follow the guidelines regarding presentation, report sections, the inserting of the progressive word count and procedures around referencing (specifically, the uncertainty of the differences between a ‘references’ versus a ‘bibliography’ page).

Referencing remains an issue even though there is a number of tools available to candidates to remedy this aspect of their work. A few folios had track changes still marked on document.