Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

RESULT

BACHELORS DEGREE ASSIGNMENT SPECIFICATION

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Student name:	**Anonymous assignment**	**Student P number:**	**n/a**
Programme:	**BSc Psychology** **BA Counselling Studies and Psychology** **BA Education Studies and Psychology**		
Module:	**Developmental Psychology and Individual Differences**	**Module Level (4, 5, 6):**	**4**
Module code:	**M5X00910**	**Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):**	**50%**
Lecturer:	**Dr Judith Marshall**	**Internal Verifier:**	
Assignment Title:	**Compare and contrast two theories of moral development.**	**Assignment No (x of x):**	**CW50_1** **1 of 1**
Hand Out Date:	**March 2018**	**Submission deadline:**	**Midday, Thursday** **26th April 2018**
Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	**24th May 2018**		

Referencing:	In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have read or quoted in order to complete this assignment (e.g. for books: surname of author and initials, year of publication, title of book, edition, publisher: place of publication).		
Submission:	**All assignments must be submitted to Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer.** **Note**: the Turnitin version is the only submission and acts as a receipt for the student. **Late submission will result in a late penalty mark.** Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 40%. Over one week late, Refer. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may grant an extension.	**Date:**	**Midday, Thursday 26th April 2018**

Lecturer to tick to indicate if a hard copy version of the assignment must be submitted.	**YES**	
	NO	**x**

DO NOT put this form into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.

Learning Outcomes tested (from module syllabus)	Assessment Criteria: To achieve each outcome a student must demonstrate the ability to:
Evaluate psychological theories and concepts that determine physiological and psychological development of an individual across the lifespan	Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of two psychological theories of the development of moral reasoning.
Recognise the historical and cultural context of specific developmental theories	Identify and discuss key historical and cultural influences relating to explanations of moral development
The ability to present work suitable for an academic audience through appropriate media	Present work to required conventions using appropriate media

TASK DESCRIPTION

In one 2,000 (± 10%) word assignment you must compare and contrast **two** theories of moral development, highlighting areas of strength and weakness of each theory. Your essay must be supported by evidence from the psychological literature throughout.

Your assignment must follow the academic conventions for Psychology, and the guidance provided in your Academic Skills module should be adhered to. Primary and secondary sources must be cited appropriately both within the text and in your reference list, and all references must be in the APA referencing style.

GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPLETION OF TASKS

NOTE: The guidance offered below is linked to the five common assessment criteria overleaf.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	**Specific guidance in relation to each assessment criteria**
Research-informed Literature	Your essay must include reference to a range of primary sources, in addition to secondary sources. APA referencing and citing of sources must be accurate throughout.
Knowledge and Understanding of Subject	At level five, your essay should demonstrate the extent of your knowledge of the topic area and your understanding of the concepts and underlying theories associated with this topic area. It should also demonstrate your ability to synthesise information from a variety of sources to reach valid conclusions.
Analysis	At level five it is expected that you will demonstrate your ability to analyse different psychological explanations of moral reasoning to identify determine the strength of the arguments. You must cite empirical evidence and theory throughout your essay.
Research and Problem-Solving Skills	You should demonstrate your understanding through identification of some strengths and weaknesses of these psychological explanations.
Academic and Professional Skills	Your essay should be well-written and your appropriate use of sources should be referenced presented with and good citing and referencing in APA style throughout.

MARKING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

This section details the assessment criteria. The *extent* to which these are demonstrated by you determines your mark. The marks available for each criterion are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	**Marks available**	**Marks awarded**
1. Research-informed Literature Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions.		
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.		
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence		
4. Research and Problem-Solving Skills Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.		
5. Skills for Professional Practice Attributes in professional practice: individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation.		

Assignment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance only until they are confirmed.)	**Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate)**		**%**
	Up to 1 week late	40% Max	
	Over 1 week late	0%	

COMMON ASSESSMENT AND MARKING CRITERIA

Assessment Criteria	OUTRIGHT FAIL 0-29%	UNSATISFACTORY 30-39%*	SATISFACTORY 40-49%	GOOD 50-59%	VERY GOOD 60-69%	EXCELLENT 70-79%	EXCEPTIONAL 80-100%
1. Research-informed Literature Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions	Little or no evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions largely ignored.	Poor evidence of reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Referencing conventions used inconsistently.	References to a limited range of mostly relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Referencing conventions evident though not always applied consistently.	Inclusion of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Referencing conventions mostly consistently applied.	Inclusion of a wide range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Very good use of referencing conventions, consistently applied.	A comprehensive range of research informed literature embedded in the work. Excellent selection of relevant and credible sources. High-level referencing skills, consistently applied.	Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Outstanding selection of relevant and credible sources. High-level referencing skills consistently and professionally applied.
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies.	Evidence of basic knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and underlying principles.	Knowledge is accurate with a good understanding of the field of study.	Knowledge is extensive. Exhibits understanding of the breadth and depth of established views.	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and key theories. Clear awareness of challenges to established views and the limitations of the knowledge base.	Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the main theories/concepts, and a critical awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge.
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence	Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable/ missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate.	Some evidence of analytical intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas/findings sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalised statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, albeit with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings/ views, but evidence not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions and recommendations, where relevant	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse new and/or abstract data and situations without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions and recommendations, where relevant	Sound, logical, analytical thinking; synthesis and evaluation. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity & significance of evidence. Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions / recommendations.	Thoroughly logical work, supported by evaluated evidence. High quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong, persuasive, conclusions, justifiable recommendations.	Exceptional work; judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Highly persuasive conclusions
4. Research and Problem-Solving Skills Effective deployment of appropriate methods, materials, tools and techniques; extent of skill demonstrated in the application of concepts to a variety of processes and/or contexts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.	Limited or no use of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application.	Rudimentary application of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application.	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of well-established methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application.	A good and appropriate application of standard methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Good appreciation of the context of the application, with some use of examples, where relevant.	A very good application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application, with perceptive use of examples, where relevant. Evidence of some innovation and creativity.	An advanced application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, with extensive use of relevant examples. Application and deployment extend beyond established conventions. Innovation and creativity evident throughout.	Outstanding levels of application and deployment skills. Assimilation and development of cutting edge processes and techniques.
5. Skills for Professional Practice Demonstrates attributes expected in professional practice including: individual initiative and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media to communicate (including written and oral); clarity and effectiveness in presentation and organisation.	Communication media is inappropriate or misapplied. Little or no evidence of autonomy in the completion of tasks. Work is poorly structured and/or largely incoherent.	Media is poorly designed and/or not suitable for the audience. Poor independent or collaborative initiative. Work lacks structure, organisation, and/or coherence	Can communicate in a suitable format but with some room for improvement. Can work as part of a team, but with limited involvement in group activities. Work lacks coherence in places and could be better structured.	Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Can work effectively as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure.	Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Can work very well as part of a team, with very good contribution to group activities. Work is coherent and fluent and is well structured and organised.	Can communicate professionally and, confidently in a suitable format. Can work professionally within a team, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations. Work is coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally.	Can communicate with an exceptionally high level of professionalism. Can work exceptionally well and professionally within a team, showing advanced leadership skills. Work is exceptionally coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally.