



BACHELORS DEGREE ASSIGNMENT SPECIFICATION

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Student name:	Anonymous Submission	Student P number:	
Programme:	BSc Psychology BA Counselling Studies and Psychology BA Education Studies and Psychology		
Module:	Research Design and Analysis	Module Level (4, 5, 6):	5
Module code:	M5X00913	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	25%
Lecturer:	Dr Paul Hutchings	Internal Verifier:	Dr Ceri Phelps
Assignment Title:	Ten minute academic interview on proposed dissertation idea	Assignment No (x of x):	PERF25_1 3 of 4
Hand Out Date:	13/10/17	Submission deadline:	Interview will take place Thursday 26 th April 2018
Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	Thursday 24 th 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, <u>title of book</u> , 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:	12pm Thursday 26 th April 2017
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:
Understand and evaluate the link between theory and research design. Demonstrate a strong awareness of ethical issues associated with qualitative and quantitative research design Carry out and report a quantitative study using appropriate tools and software Analyse and evaluate qualitative data using appropriate data analysis tools and software The ability to present work suitable for an academic audience through appropriate media	Discuss the reasons a researcher may choose a specific study design in terms of theory, measures, ethical implications, and potential results. Critically consider the ethical implications of different study designs. Conduct and report a quantitative study appropriately. Analyse and report a qualitative study appropriately. Present work to required conventions using appropriate media.

TASK DESCRIPTION

You are required to orally convey, through a ten minute academic interview, a suitable dissertation research proposal. You may use the written proposal form attached to this proforma as a basis on which to base your argument. However, you will **NOT** be assessed on the written proposal itself; you will only be assessed on the academic interview based upon the following criteria:

- Understanding of theoretical issues associated with your research proposal
- Consideration of practical issues (such as recruitment and data collection) with the intended design
- Consideration of the ethical dilemmas associated with the proposed project

Individual interviews will then take place **Thursday 26th April 2018**. Please consult Moodle for your individual interview time.

Points to address for the academic interview

- 1 Tell us, in general terms, what your research is about
- 2 What are the key psychological theories or models that underpin your proposal?
- 3 Talk us through the design of your study
 - In what way is your intervention or manipulation based upon the theory covered in Point 2 above?
 - How has the design of your study been influenced by these theoretical constructs or models?
 - How are you going to measure these theoretical constructs/models in your study?
- 4 What is novel about your study which will add to the psychological literature on this topic?
- 5 Explain to us what taking part in your study would involve, from the perspective of one of your participants
- 6 What type of data will you be collecting and how will you analyse it?
- 7 What specific ethical considerations have to be considered in relation to your study? How will you deal with these issues for your study?
- 8 How have you calculated the number of required participants for your study?

Academic Interview and the Psychology Dissertation process

Please note: It is **not** a requirement of the Academic Interview assessment that the study you present at interview **has to be** your dissertation proposal; however, in the second semester of Level Five we encourage you to start engaging with potential academic supervisors for your Level Six dissertation, and so there may be information from these discussions that guides you in your interview. Also, it would be making extra work for yourself if you devise and research a study for the academic interview and then a completely different study for your dissertation. Finally, feedback from your Academic Interview may provide some useful guidance for you as you put your dissertation proposal together over the summer. Therefore the academic team recommends that you approach the Academic Interview assessment as if it will be your Psychology Dissertation proposal.

To this end we have made available the dissertation proposal form, which you will have to complete for the Psychology Dissertation module in your final year. You may wish to use this for your own guidance alone, but we will also allow you to submit this to the academic team in the week before your interview, and we will use it for guidance (that is, we will look at it before the interview but it will form no part of our assessment of your interview for this module); there is no summative requirement for you to submit this proposal but we have often found that those students who do submit it do better in the interview (it helps to clarify your own understanding of the study idea and methodology process and enables us to have an idea of what you will be talking about in your interview).

DISSERTATION PROPOSAL 2017-18

(Non-Assessed: to be submitted by midday Tuesday 24th April 2018 if you wish to do so)

Student Name	
Provisional Dissertation Supervisor	
Date submitted	

Title of Research (this must reflect the essence of your proposed research question, study design and study population and should be more specific than the broad topic area provided in the dissertation topics selection book).

Please state your main research question(s) (specific hypotheses not needed at this stage but may be included)

What empirical evidence supports your research question? (Please provide a 1500 word review of relevant psychological literature and theory and a minimum of eight references). If you have already drafted a review of literature please attach it to the end of this document – you do not need to complete this section if so).

Please describe your participant group (including anticipated number of participants required) and any specific inclusion/exclusion criteria.

Please provide brief details of the anticipated design (e.g., between, within, mixed, regression, focus groups, interviews, experimental, questionnaires) and main procedure for your study (it should be clear from this how you are actually planning to carry out your study, and what will be happening to your participants).

What measures are you planning to use for data collection and how will this data be used in the analysis in order to answer your research question? (Be as specific as possible here – what type of data will you be obtaining, what specific topics/measures/scales/instruments will you be using and what will you do with this data?)

What are the main ethical issues that you will need to address in this study? (Please note all students will need to complete the full ethics form prior to final approval for data collection being given).

Student Name (Please print clearly) _____

Student Signature _____ Date _____

Proposal Outcome	Supervisor to tick one only
Satisfactory proposal (proceed to SREC ethical approval; all final materials to be approved by supervisor before data collection).	
Satisfactory proposal – some minor areas requiring clarification before submitting for SREC approval (see below for required actions)	
Proposal requiring full consideration by Faculty REC due to the nature of the study	
Unsatisfactory – proposal lacking significant detail - must be resubmitted within seven days following feedback (see below)	
Unsatisfactory - proposal is considered unethical/unworkable in practice. New proposal to be developed following feedback from supervisor (see below)	

Supervisory team additional comments/feedback:

Action required:

Date of comments/feedback :

Supervisor's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer comments: (to be completed by interviewer only)

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 interview must be informed by prior research on appropriate research design according to the topic chosen to research.
Knowledge and Understanding of Subject	Your interview must demonstrate the extent of your knowledge and understanding of the ethical considerations and design issues that may need to be taken into account with the proposed project.
Analysis	You should provide a robust argument for your proposed research design and methodology. You must show that you are aware of reliability of research designs and methods of data collection.
Research and Problem-Solving Skills	You should be able to demonstrate how you have formulated specific research questions and a proposed methodology for your intended project. You must also demonstrate an understanding of the materials you intend to u
Academic and Professional Skills	You must demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally and confidently in your interview.

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. Academic and Professional Skills 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

	OUTRIGHT FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT	EXCEPTIONAL
Assessment Criteria	0-29%	30-39%*	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	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. Academic and Professional Skills 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.