

- **General comments on what students did well –**
  - Better reports did well in sourcing more recent literature to support the original Tversky and Kahnemann study, for example, research using social media, health issues. In particular, the use of relevant published journal articles in addition to text book and very old studies showed engagement with the research.
  - Building a clear rationale for the study and pointing out specifically what was different about your study in comparison to the original study (e.g., the words used, time limit, population sampled) shows that you have understood the purpose of the study.
  - Stronger reports showed that they had read the original research, *and* more recent critiques/alternative explanations of the availability heuristic. This demonstrates evaluation, by use of clear evidence based arguments as to the pros and cons of their own methodology and the theoretical implications.
  - Evaluation of the methodology was strong, and intelligent ideas for future research.
  - Clearly and accurately detailed the appropriate information in both the methods and results section, using appropriate format.
- **General comments on what students did poorly, i.e. why did students get low grades, or common mistakes?**
  - A reliance on text book sources and very old studies-while these are relevant it doesn't show engagement with the literature.
  - No clear links between your own study and the research presented and discussed. The literature review and the discussion were often presented in an essay form, and not in the context of your own findings.
  - No clear link between the literature reviewed and the literature discussed.
  - Presentation. Structure of paragraphs meant it was often difficult to find the "thread" of the arguments made. Subheadings were incorrectly used in the method section. Reporting of statistics was inconsistent, e.g., check that you report the descriptive stats in the text.
  - Limited consideration of relevant and related research in the discussion with too much focus on applications, future studies or limitations that would make the findings obsolete.
- **Feedforward – general advice on how to approach the next lab report in Semester 2.**
  - Start reading widely, and start your research early so you have time to read and evaluate it.
  - Don't try and cover too much in the research review, as you have a limited number of words. Prioritise the key studies, and use additional studies to support your points.
  - Be specific in the rationale-think about what the aims of your study are, why is it important? How does it compare to previous findings?
  - Refer to previous literature in relation to your own, particularly in the discussion. Compare and contrast your findings.
  - Close the "loop". Refer back to relevant research presented in the literature review in your discussion.
  - Revisit the report writing guide-particularly the sections where the marker has indicated where you need to improve.
  - Consult the statistics and research methods moodle page for advice on how to present the results.
  - Attend the report writing workshops (SLS), and PAL if you are struggling.