HONOURS IN PSYCHOLOGY

Program Guide

2019

Note: Information in this Guide may change before the start of the Honours year 2019

(Updated 08 February 2019)
INTRODUCTION TO HONOURS IN PSYCHOLOGY

Honours in Psychology aims to build on the knowledge and skills that you have learned in your undergraduate career and has been designed to emphasise both theoretical and practical knowledge in psychology. The aim of the program is to build on your knowledge of psychology and the principles that underlie the development of new knowledge in psychology. However, Honours is also a time of social, professional and intellectual development in which students become better acquainted with some of the central features of academic life: seminars, workshops, presentation of work to colleagues, research design and communication of scientific findings.

Accordingly, students are generally given more autonomy and responsibility for their own intellectual development during this year than before. Our Honours degree aims to develop your skills, under supervision, as an independent researcher and innovative thinker. Honours will also test your organisational skills, including your ability to prepare, define, plan, carry out and report on research. As an Honours student in psychology, you will undertake your own empirical research on a topic you choose to study in consultation with an academic supervisor. In doing so, your research should involve the creation of new information and knowledge in your chosen field.

Several learning goals underpin the program. By the end of the Honours program you will have further developed your:

- knowledge of theory, measurement and analysis in psychology;
- understanding of the relationship between causal factors, processes and outcomes;
- problem-solving abilities as both a producer and consumer of scientific knowledge;
- analytical and critical thinking skills;
- written and oral communication skills.

These learning goals provide the impetus for both the research project and the coursework components of the program.

Please note that this guide is specifically prepared for Honours in Psychology. The ANU College of Health and Medicine / College of Science Honours Handbook can be accessed at:
https://science.anu.edu.au/current-students/forms-policies-guidelines/honours-handbook
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STRUCTURE OF THE HONOURS PROGRAM

Coursework

By the end of the Psychology Honours Program, you will complete three compulsory streams. All students (including part-time) will complete all three coursework streams in the first year of their enrolment. Part-time students will commence their research project in the second year of their Honours enrolment. The Statistics stream contains a core component plus a number of modules from which you select four. Some of these may be offered in second semester. Information about this will be given in the first Research Methods class, but an outline can be found below. Note the intensive work load in the beginning of the semester: three by two hours of lectures per week, for four weeks.

Statistics
- Semester 1
- 4 weeks x 6 hours (3 x 2 hour classes) plus additional seminars

Theory in Psychology
- Semester 1
- 9 weeks x 3 hours

Evidence-Based Assessment and Intervention
- Semester 2
- 9 weeks x 2 hours

Research Project

Thesis
- Full year
- Meetings to be arranged with Research Supervisor

MID-YEAR ENTRY INFORMATION

The closing date for mid-year applications is the last Friday in May.

Note that the range of potential supervisors during mid-year entry is limited, given that most of the supervisors take on all of their students in Semester 1. Because the mid-year Honours entry process is slightly different and can be a different experience for students, it is suggested that you talk to one of the Honours Convenors for advice.

Please also note that mid-year entry acceptance is identical to the acceptance process at the start of the academic year. Entry requirements for mid-year entry are not lower than that of the start of the year.

THESIS DUE DATE

24 October 2019
GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSABLE WORK

• All assessable work should be submitted through Turnitin, unless your course convenor suggests otherwise.
• Late work will incur a penalty of 5% per working day (i.e., 24-hour period).
• For extensions to assignment deadlines, please refer to the ANU rules on extensions (https://policies.anu.edu.au/ppl/document/ANUP_004604).
• Extensions to thesis deadlines will only be granted due to circumstances that could not have been anticipated and that are completely beyond the student’s control. Such applications should be discussed with the Supervisor, and, following this, with the Honours Convenor – Pastoral Care (if your degree is in Science) or with the appropriate representative in CASS (if you are a BA student). Extensions must then be approved by the appropriate Deputy Dean within either Science or CASS. Note that the Psychology Honours Convenors can approve extensions only up to two weeks. Students need to be aware that when they are granted an extension, they may not receive their final mark on time to be able to graduate in December (or, if mid-year students, in July).

HONOURS RULES

We Expect That You Will:
• contribute to the academic life of the Research School of Psychology by attending all of the School’s Gibb Seminars;
• treat School and University facilities and resources with respect and care, and follow Occupational Health and Safety requirements;
• observe the relevant University and School rules and regulations;
• interact with other students and staff in accordance with the relevant University policies (e.g., Equity and Diversity Policies).

Grading
• You must pass each component of the Honours program (each course and your thesis) in order to pass the program as a whole and take out your degree.
• At the end of the year, final grades will be determined by averaging your coursework marks and then averaging this score with your thesis mark (i.e., 50% coursework, 50% research). The School Examinations Committee will make a recommendation to the College regarding the Honours grade to be awarded to each student.

Honours Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Grades (courses &amp; thesis)</th>
<th>Final grade categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>H1 (First)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>H2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>H2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Falsification and Plagiarism

- The falsification of results gained during the course of your Honours work is a serious offence. It is essential that you maintain a careful written record of experimental procedures and results. Copying or summarising another person's results or ideas as if they were your own is a form of theft. The source of such material must always be cited in the text and Reference section of your written work.
- University rules and policies concerning data falsification and plagiarism are covered on: http://www.anu.edu.au/students/program-administration/assessments-exams/academic-honesty-plagiarism. Penalties for such offences may include termination of a student's course of study.

STREAM OUTLINES

All stream outline information, including times, dates, locations, and assessment, will be made available to students on the ANU Wattle system.

GENERAL INFORMATION AND ACTIVITY DAYS

Orientation Day & Lunch
Semester 1
First Monday of the Semester, 25 February 2019, 12:00 pm, Room 2.01 (Peter Baume Building, 42A)

The Associate Director (Education) and the Honours Convener of the Research School of Psychology would like to welcome you to the School and introduce you to the structure and content of the Honours program. You will also meet the other teaching staff.

Lunch
On Orientation Day @ 1:15 pm
Psychology Building 39

A poster will be printed consisting of photographs of all of the Honours students. Students will be asked to have their photograph taken during the above time and date. Note that lunch will be provided, and you will be able to meet your fellow Honours students and the teaching and support staff in the School.

Special Ethics Seminar
Semester 1 - Date to Be Advised

This seminar will include presentations from members of the ANU Human Ethics Committee and the Research School of Psychology. Its purpose is to explain to you the procedure of applying for ethics approval for your research project.
RESEARCH PROJECT: BASIC INFORMATION

- The research project represents a significant proportion of the workload in the Honours program and will contribute 50% of students’ final mark.

- The primary aim of this section of the course is to develop students’ skills as researchers. The research project also represents an opportunity for students to learn, in depth, about a particular topic area in psychology. Students will have the opportunity to conduct empirical research within a range of broad topics. Topics are largely dependent upon the research interests of staff.

- Students will work on their own, individual research project under supervision.

- The focus of the project will develop (to at least some extent) as a function of the supervisor’s areas of expertise and interest. Remember, however, that students are primarily responsible for developing their own piece of original empirical research, based on a specific research question.

- By early May, each student will present a summary of his or her research aims, design, methods, and hypotheses to a panel of staff. This will give students an independent perspective on their planned project. Students will be expected to present for no more than 10 minutes. We will allow up to 20 minutes for discussion. This presentation is not marked; it should be clear but not overly formal. Because students may receive suggestions to change or modify aspects of their research project as a result of this presentation, students should not be collecting data before they present. If students do start collecting data before this presentation, they run the risk of having to start over to accommodate the suggested changes/modifications.

Students will be provided with more information about this presentation later in Semester 1 by their supervisor.

- Many students who do Honours in Psychology plan to do post-graduate clinical studies. As a result, they think that they must do a clinical topic for their Honours thesis. This is not the case. The topic of students’ Honours thesis will have absolutely no bearing on entry to our clinical programs. What will affect students’ chances on entry is their Honours grade. Note that given the practical problems involved in conducting clinical research at the Honours level, we advise students not to do research dealing with clinical populations for their Honours thesis.

Getting a Supervisor

- Students who are accepted into the ANU Psychology Honours program will be asked to rank-order their preferences for supervisors. The list of potential supervisors for this year is presented in Appendix A, along with most of the supervisors’ project descriptions and supervisory styles. Students are welcome to contact potential supervisors to speak with them in person (although, please note that some supervisors may not be available to meet with students prior to the ranking deadline). Students can also find out more about potential supervisors and their research areas by reading information about them from their respective ANU web pages. Students can make their rankings on any basis they wish.

- Potential supervisors will also be able to rank-order their preferences for potential students. Accordingly, students are encouraged to at least send an e-mail to supervisors with whom they wish to work and tell them a bit about themselves. Otherwise, it will be very difficult for supervisors to rank students whom they do not know.
Based on these rankings, students will be assigned to supervisors. Preference will be given when there are consistencies between students’ and supervisors’ rankings, although final preferences will be given to students’ rankings.

This procedure means:
1. Students need not – and, indeed, cannot – arrange to have an ANU Psychology research supervisor prior to the submission of their application;
2. Students may end up with an Honours research supervisor who is not their preferred choice (although note that we were never able to guarantee this in the past); clinical supervisors are often very popular, but not everyone who requests a clinical area or clinical supervisor will get their initial supervisory preference;
3. Students do not need to have a research topic prior to being assigned to a supervisor;
4. No supervisor can commit or promise to be any student’s supervisor;
5. Students commencing their ANU Psychology Honours research in 2019 will be informed of who their supervisors are in January 2019.

Things to Consider When Ranking Supervisors

- Students will be spending a lot of time with their supervisor over the course of the year. Students, thus, should try to ensure that the supervision style is compatible with how they (the students) like to work.

- Students will be spending a lot of time working on the thesis, so it is best if they can work in an area of psychology in which they have some initial interest. However, students must know that the Research School of Psychology cannot and will not guarantee that students will be able to have their first (or even second or third) preference of supervisors or research topics.

Upon accepting students into the ANU Honours in Psychology Program, the Research School of Psychology will guarantee that every student will be able to have a supervisor. And, as noted above, we realize that it is most likely best for students to have supervisors in research areas in which they (the students) are most interested. However, a match of interests is neither a requirement nor a guarantee. In the end, what is most important is that students receive quality supervision in some area of psychological research. This means that some students may be asked to complete a Research Project in an area of psychology that is not one in which that have initially high levels of interest.

Expectations of Students and Supervisors

_Parts of this section have been taken from the College Honours Handbook_  
As an Honours student, you are at a stage intermediate between undergraduate and graduate work. Formally, the university classifies you as an undergraduate. However, your work is more like that of a graduate student. During Honours you will experience some of the independence and self-direction required of graduate research students, but you also have close contact and direction from your supervisor(s).

All Honours students have a supervisor. The relationship between supervisor and student involves obligations on the part of both parties. Your supervisor will assist you with advice, guidance and criticism and help you to achieve your personal academic goals. The supervisor is there to help you choose and design the research project, guide the research in a practical and productive way, and advise you on writing the best thesis of which you are capable. At the same time, your supervisor can only guide your efforts, and then only if you are receptive to advice. You must take the responsibility for the final results of your work.
We expect that you will:

- Maintain a close dialogue and constructive working relationship with your supervisor(s);
- Plan your research program and budget with your supervisor(s);
- Consider advice seriously. If advice is not taken, the supervisor should be informed and given the reasons for the decision;
- Consult regularly with your supervisor. Students should prepare in advance for consultations, by determining the help they require and the areas in which advice would be useful;
- Interact with other students and staff in accordance with the relevant University policies;
- Contribute to the academic life of the School and Honours specialisation by attending all relevant seminars;
- Treat School and University facilities and resources with respect and care, and follow Occupational Health and Safety requirements;
- Observe the relevant University, College and School rules and regulations;
- Complete the formal requirements for Honours;
- Complete, to the best of your ability, a well written, thorough and competent thesis of the highest standard.

Your supervisor also has responsibilities. These are to:

- Assist you in selecting and defining the scope of a suitable thesis topic or problem;
- Meet with you at the commencement of your research project to set expectations for your Honours year;
- Assist you in designing your thesis research and devising a schedule for its execution;
- Guide you in the selection and application of appropriate data collection and analysis procedures and advise on the solution of any difficulties that arise;
- Meet frequently with you to discuss and evaluate each stage of the thesis project;
- Monitor your progress and advise you when progress is unsatisfactory;
- Facilitate progress, including, in consultation with the Honours Convenor, redefining the scope of the project when relevant;
- Advise on matters of thesis content, organisation and writing, including the timely provision of feedback, written and oral, on drafts or portions of the thesis;
- Assist you in gaining clearance from the ANU Human Ethics Committee as required.

The Honours supervisor must be available for the entire period of the research project except for periods of less than two weeks. Any exception, where the supervisor will be unavailable for longer periods, must be reported to the Honours convener. The Honours convener may discuss with the student as well as the supervisor, and will determine whether appointment of a suitably experienced co-supervisor is required, taking into account the specific situation.

For inexperienced supervisors or those new to the ANU, a mentor / co-supervisor arrangement is required to ensure support and guidance is provided to the supervisor and student.

Subject to approval by the Honours convener, thesis supervision may be provided by a person outside the School provided that this supervisor is substantially involved in the Honours specialisation and is responsible to the Head of the School for the supervision of the student. In such cases there must be a co-supervisor who meets the requirements of Clause 36 of the Coursework Awards Rule 2016.
Use of Shared/Secondary Data

Following the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council guidelines for Honours theses, we now allow Honours students to share data and/or jointly collect data and to use secondary (or archive) data. Clearly, each student still needs to use the data to ask their own, unique research question, but in many cases students are working on similar issues with the same supervisor, and therefore jointly collecting data makes it much easier to obtain the data. This is especially true for research projects that require many subjects, such as social psychology experiments and cognitive experiments that investigate group differences (e.g., those comparing dyslexic and non-dyslexic children). There are also a number of existing data sets that can be used to answer new questions. Theses that make use of shared data and/or joint collection of data or secondary data are viewed and assessed in the same way as those in which the student collects data by themselves.

Students who share a dataset, jointly collect data, or use secondary data need to do the following.

- Students need to make a formal declaration in the acknowledgements section of the thesis that shared data/secondary data were used, and with shared data set out clearly their own unique contributions to the design and collection of the data.
- Students may need to enlarge on this acknowledgement and description, if necessary, in the Method and Results sections. They can also put information into an Appendix (so it will not be included in the word count).
- Students need to have more detailed and/or complex theory and results sections to compensate for not actually conducting the study themselves.
- With secondary data, students need to critique the existing measures and their appropriateness for pursuing their specific research questions (e.g., students may need to state whether different or better measures could be used, or what they would do in case they were designing the study, measures, or items themselves).
The Honours thesis is very different to anything that students have done during their undergraduate years. In order to give students some guidance as to how they should be progressing throughout the year, we have developed the following milestones that must be completed. It is each student’s responsibility to ensure that the milestones are completed on time and that they have obtained their supervisor's signature on the Honours Milestone Completion Form (available on the following page) upon completion of each milestone. They should submit the completed Honours Milestone Completion Form as part of their thesis submission. They will need to scan the completed form and then include it in an Appendix of their thesis as a scanned image.

It is important to note that – although we do not expect students to need an extension for the submission of their thesis, and such extensions are only given for delays caused by unforeseen factors outside of students’ control – no student will be eligible for an extension if they have failed to meet any of these milestones. Use the form on the following page to keep track of these milestones.

• **Milestone 1. Presentation of Research Proposal**
  This is to be done in Semester 1 prior to the commencement of data collection. Typically, presentations should be made about three months after the start of the semester (i.e., April/May or October/November for mid-year students). This should be arranged with students’ supervisor.

• **Milestone 2. Mid-Course Progress Report**
  This must include a meeting with the Honours Convenor or their delegate(s) to discuss progress. This is due in June/July or January/February for mid-year students.

• **Milestone 3. Major Data Collection and Analyses Completed**
  One month prior to the submission of the thesis, both the supervisor and the student must sign off on the scope of all data collection and data analysis required for the completion of the thesis, indicating that they think the thesis is on track. If they think the thesis is not on track, this needs to be discussed with the Honours Convenors immediately and the reasons for the problems explained. Extensions to the thesis due date will only be given for delays caused by unforeseen factors outside of students’ control.

• **Milestone 4. Thesis Draft Submitted to Supervisor and Feedback Returned by Supervisor.**
  Two weeks prior to the submission of the thesis, both the supervisors and the student must confirm that the first draft of the thesis (excluding the Discussion section) has been submitted to the supervisor and has been returned to the student by the supervisor with comments.
Milestone 1. Presentation of Research Proposal

This is to be done in Semester 1 prior to the commencement of data collection. Typically, presentations should be made about three months after the start of the semester (i.e., April/May or October/November for mid-year students). This should be arranged with students’ supervisor.

Supervisor’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Milestone 2. Mid-Course Progress Report

This must include a meeting with the Honours Convenor or their delegate(s) to discuss progress. This is due in June/July or January/February for mid-year students.

Supervisor’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Milestone 3. Major Data Collection and Analyses Completed

One month prior to the submission of the thesis, both the supervisor and the student must sign off on the scope of all data collection and data analysis required for the completion of the thesis, indicating that they think the thesis is on track. If they think the thesis is not on track, this needs to be discussed with the Honours Convenors immediately and the reasons for the problems explained. Extensions to the thesis due date will only be given for delays caused by unforeseen factors outside of students’ control.

Supervisor’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Student’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Milestone 4. Thesis Draft Submitted to Supervisor and Feedback Returned by Supervisor

Two weeks prior to the submission of the thesis, both the supervisors and the student must confirm that the first draft of the thesis (excluding the Discussion section) has been submitted to the supervisor and has been returned to the student by the supervisor with comments.

Supervisor’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Student’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Ethics Approval

- All research projects must be approved by the appropriate ANU Ethics Committee.

- If you are not doing your research under your supervisor’s ethics approval, then you must apply for ethics approval using the appropriate ANU on-line Ethics Application form. Do not use any other form; the Committee will not accept it. The ethics seminar will provide the information for completing this process.

- You will need to know a lot about your research project before you can complete the form. However, you should aim to get your ethics form in as soon as you can, as approval usually takes from one to two months.

- Ethics forms received by the Ethics Committee by the end of the month will be reviewed at their next meeting at the beginning of the following month (e.g., forms received at the end of May will be reviewed in the first week of June, and if no problems arise with your proposal, will be approved by mid-July).

- You may not begin your research before getting formal approval from the Ethics Committee.

- All ethics forms should be reviewed by your Supervisor.

- In some cases, supervisors will have already obtained approval for projects that may well cover your research (if your research is similar enough). In these instances, it may be possible to simply add your name to the existing ethics protocol. It is a good idea to check this with your Supervisor as this option may save you some time.
**THE THESIS**

- The typical thesis is between 10,000 and 12,000 words; the word limit is 12,000 words, **NOT INCLUDING** acknowledgements, title page, table of contents, in-text tables, in-text figures, titles of tables or figures, references in the Reference section and appendices. The word count **INCLUDES** the Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion, in-text citations or references and in-text statistics. The length of the thesis must **not** exceed 12,000 words. Theses that exceed 12,000 words will be returned to the student for pruning. During the period of thesis reduction, normal late penalties apply.

- Supervisors can **read**, discuss, and give feedback on only **two** drafts of the thesis (but excluding the Discussion section). Accordingly, only **one** draft of the Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results, and then **one** draft of the whole thesis (excluding the Discussion section), should be submitted to your supervisor for formal written comments. **Note that supervisors are not allowed to read and give any kind of feedback (written or verbal) on the Discussion section of the thesis.** Supervisors are also not allowed to have any part of the Discussion section read to them. The Discussion section is supposed to be an independent representation of students’ writing. Note that a general discussion between supervisors and students about the content and purpose of the Discussion section is allowed, and supervisors may refer to the Discussion section when reading and commenting on other drafts of other sections.

- The presentation of the thesis must adhere to accepted APA (American Psychological Association) format (see Appendices A and B for information on writing and handing in your thesis). A copy of the APA guide will be made available in the Honours room towards the end of the year.

- Penalties for late thesis submission are 5% per working day (i.e., 24-hour period).

- The thesis will be submitted in hardcopy (unbound) and also on Wattle on the day specified by the College. Note, however, that the **hard copy must be submitted to the Psychology Enquiries Office by 4:00 p.m. on the due dates set by the College.** (NOTE: The due date for Psychology has not been set at the time of this document’s creation).

**Some Information on Hypotheses or Predictions**

In some cases, it may be appropriate to make a single set of predictions. This occurs when you have one theory driving the research, and this theory predicts a clear set of outcomes in your study. For example, 'Theory X predicts that I will observe effects A, B and C.' **THIS FORMAT IS NOT COMPULSORY, as many research questions are not of this form.**

Often the aim of your project is to discriminate between two (or more) competing theoretical ideas. Under these circumstances it is not appropriate to illogically 'predict' that one particular set of outcomes will be observed. An appropriate format is 'If theoretical idea X is true, the outcomes A, B and C would be predicted. On the other hand, if theoretical idea Y is true, the outcomes D, E and F would be predicted.'

It is often appropriate to distinguish between 'predictions' with different degrees of theoretical status. Sometimes, you expect a particular outcome for one part of your study only because someone has observed that empirical finding previously, not because of any theoretical reason. In this case, it might be more appropriate to say 'Based on the findings of Z (2001), I expected to replicate the result A' rather than 'I predict result A.' Sometimes a result is predicted by theory, but is a well-established
finding in the literature, and you merely need to replicate it before you can turn to your new questions of interest. In this case, an appropriate format might be 'Based on theory X and previous empirical findings (e.g., Z, 2001), I expected to replicate result A in the adult group. The question of interest was then whether children would show this same pattern, as would be predicted by developmental theory M, or whether they would fail to show the effect, as predicted by developmental theory N.'

Assessment of the Research Component of the Program

• The thesis will be marked by two examiners (not your Supervisor) whose assessment of your thesis will contribute 50% to your final Honours mark. Your Supervisor will provide a written report on your performance during the year to the examiners.

• Marking criteria for Honours theses are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKING CRITERIA FOR HONOURS THESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Research School of Psychology uses a marking guide to assess theses. The College also provides a guide for the assessment of the research component of the Honours year. Both are provided below.

When marking an Honours thesis, judgements will be based upon students’:

• review of relevant research;
• statement of the problem and its justification in the light of previous theory and research;
• competence and sophistication in research design, including skills in design of measurement, equipment, or selection of subjects;
• competence in data analysis, and presentation of results;
• ability to relate results to previous research, to discuss their theoretical significance, and to suggest possibilities for further research;
• structure of the argument, clarity and elegance of expression, and adherence to APA guidelines;
• level of originality and initiative displayed throughout the year.

College Grading Criteria
(The descriptions below are copied directly from the College Handbook)

The following criteria are used to assess the quality of theses and to assign grades. Departments will ask the supervisors to comment on whether the students have demonstrated some of these characteristics; while the judgement on other characteristics will rely purely on the thesis.

Honours III 50-59%
• The student has demonstrated some knowledge of the relevant background literature, but with serious gaps, and limited understanding;
• The student applied relevant techniques and carried out research work, but needed considerable assistance and showed limited understanding of the procedures employed;
• The student presented their results, though in a somewhat muddled and/or incomplete way.

Honours IIB 60-69%
As for Honours III, but in addition:
• The student has demonstrated a reasonable knowledge of the relevant background literature, with only a few gaps, albeit in a somewhat uncritical way;
• The student demonstrated that they had learned many of the relevant skills (which might include laboratory techniques, computer programming and statistical analysis);
• The student presented their results in an appropriate format, and communicated them effectively.

Honours IIA 70-79%
As for Honours IIB, but in addition:
• The student has demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the relevant background literature, though still with limited critical appreciation;
• The student demonstrated reasonable technical mastery of all the relevant skills;
• The student worked hard, efficiently and carefully;
• The student presented their results and/or data clearly and succinctly.

Honours I 80-89%
As for Honours IIA, but in addition:
• The student has critically analysed the relevant background literature rather than merely summarising it;
• The thesis demonstrates a clear appreciation of how their work fits in to the larger field of research;
• The student demonstrated considerable technical mastery of all the relevant skills;
• They showed some appreciation of the limitations of the experimental design or techniques used and have outlined future research directions that are feasible;
• The student put forward their own useful and valid ideas relating to the project;
• The student further demonstrated the ability to see, and take, the logical next step without excessive 'prodding', the ability to act independently of the supervisor's immediate direction and presence, but the maturity to know when the supervisor's help is necessary;
• The student demonstrated the persistence and ability to carry on under difficulty;
• They picked up new concepts and skills rapidly;
• They showed the ability to work effectively in the presence of others.

Honours I >90%
As above, but in addition:
• The student obtained concepts and procedures independently from the literature and at least discussed a use for them in the study;
• The student demonstrated impressive technical mastery of all the relevant skills;
• They demonstrate a good understanding not only of the techniques they employed, but other alternative techniques and the reasons for choosing between them;
• They have outlined possible future directions which are not merely feasible but which show considerable originality;
• The student not only put forward useful and valid ideas relating to the project, but also demonstrated the ability to critically evaluate and act upon such ideas.
### Research School of Psychology Marking Guide

- This description is intended as a guide only
- For any one criterion, the candidate does not have to satisfy all points under each grade to obtain that grade
- The candidate may satisfy any one criterion at different levels. Markers must exercise their own judgement in awarding grades against each criterion

---

**Criterion 1:** Review of relevant research. Statement of the problem and its justification in the light of previous theory and research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **HD 80-100** |  | • Review represents a thorough and appropriately detailed coverage of the relevant literature. The candidate may incorporate novel (but relevant) areas of research/literature  
• Presentation and interpretation of theories and research findings are accurate and insightful  
• Interpretations of theory and statements of fact are clearly presented and given a strong and convincing basis in evidence  
• Where the candidate cites evidence, s/he uses the most appropriate reference  
• The candidate goes beyond already published claims and presents his or her own substantiated interpretation of the literature  
• The problem driving the research is clearly stated. The problem is broken down in terms of clear hypotheses, themselves in the form of statements of causal relationships  
• The problem and associated hypotheses are demonstrably derived from a sound and accurate understanding of the literature  
• The proposed problem or the approach to understanding the problem is worth pursuing and is insightful or creative |
| **D 70-79** |  | • Review covers all core areas of the literature in sufficient detail, with no significant intrusions of irrelevant material  
• The material presented is clearly understood by the candidate  
• Statements of fact or claims made are accurate, supported by evidence and are based on fact/logic, not opinion  
• The problem behind the research is identifiable and is framed in terms of statements of hypotheses. The candidate gives a clear presentation of predictions  
• The research problem represents a logical step forward, based on the presentation of the literature  
• The candidate proposes to make an original and worthwhile contribution to the development of theory, methodology or scientific knowledge |
| **Cr 60-69** |  | • Review covers most areas of the literature accurately but omits other key areas  
• The candidate may spend some time introducing areas of work that do not appear to make any real contribution  
• Statements of fact or claims made are usually but not always supported by evidence |
### Criterion 1: Adequacy of literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 50-59 | - Review is relevant but heavily one-sided  
- The candidate does not explain theories adequately, does not appear to ‘engage’ with the literature or does not appear to fully understand the material  
- Minor statements of fact or claims are wrong are misinterpreted from the literature  
- The literature is presented in an uncritical way  
- Makes improbable leaps of logic in the presentation of literature or arguments  
- Research aims and hypotheses are evident but do not follow from the treatment of the literature |
| F ≤49 | - Presentation and interpretation of theories and research findings is obviously and consistently wrong  
- The candidate fails to present any mention of his/her research aims/problem  
- The problem under investigation is irrelevant or not psychological in nature |

###Criterion 2: Competence and sophistication of research design, including skills in design of measurement, equipment, or selection of subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HD 80-100 | - The approach to answering the research question is highly original and imaginative. The design reflects an advanced understanding of the key issues in this area of research  
- Variables have been operationalised in creative and novel ways  
- The candidate employs a method of gathering data that is ideally suited to answering the research question. The method chosen is also technically sophisticated or highly creative. This study has been very well constructed and executed  
- A real and successful effort has been made to access the best sample of participants  
- The study contains nothing that is superfluous or irrelevant  
- AND – all criteria for a D grade have been satisfied |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D 70-79 | - The research is original (not a simple replication, using the same design, sample, measures etc. as a previous study)  
- The design will allow a clear test of the research aims/hypotheses  
- The candidate has chosen an appropriate method/equipment to investigate the research question  
- Variables have been operationalised in a way that is valid  
- Measures are well targeted and their inclusion is justified (e.g., Measures are sensitive enough and allow the researcher to draw conclusions about causal factors)  
- If standard measures are being used, they are the most relevant available. The candidate has used a novel combination of instruments or measures  
- Manipulation checks (where appropriate) have been included and are appropriate  
- Scales are appropriate and useful  
- The study has been designed in such a way as to allow findings to be generalised beyond the sample tested  
- The sample is representative and theoretically relevant  
- The sample size is appropriate |
| Cr 60-69 | - The research represents a very simple extension of past work, using existing, standard measures  
- The method of gathering data (e.g., survey, experiment) is suited to the research question  
- The candidate appears to have included measures unnecessarily or without justification and/or the candidate may have omitted some key measures  
- The design has been constructed in order to provide a test of the research aims |
| P 50-59 | - The study is a simple replication of past research (is not original in any significant respect)  
- The method of gathering data is suitable but suboptimal for addressing the research question  
- The study is unwieldy or unnecessarily complex  
- Measures may make sense in the light of research aims but are not well thought out or constructed  
- The sample size is inadequate even though it would have been possible to obtain an adequate sample |
| F ≤49 | - The research method or design does not allow the candidate to address the research question |
Criterion 3:  Competence in data analysis, and presentation of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HD 80-100 | - The results section provides a very clear, insightful and appropriately detailed summary of the data  
- Analyses are appropriate for the hypotheses and are performed with a high degree of competency  
- The candidate has demonstrated a sophisticated knowledge of the procedures used  
- The result section gives the impression that the candidate is completely familiar with the purpose of the study and with the data  
- The results section does not contain any omissions or errors |
| D 70-79 | - Data analysis is appropriate and provides a summary of the data that is relevant to hypotheses  
- All appropriate statistics/measures are reported  
- The data are presented clearly and the results section is succinct and easy to follow |
| Cr 60-69 | - The analyses performed may not be optimal but they allow the candidate to draw conclusions about the data  
- The candidate may fail to report all measures or effects or may not perform all analyses implied by hypotheses/research aims |
| P 50-59 | - The candidate presents analyses that are unnecessarily complex or insufficiently detailed  
- The candidate may not report all necessary measures  
- The candidate may not appear to have fully understood the data or purpose of the study |
| F ≤49 | - The techniques used are fundamentally incorrect or are used incorrectly, despite being appropriate for a 4th year level thesis  
- The analysis may be done correctly but the candidate fundamentally misinterprets the data |

Criterion 4:  Ability to relate results to previous research, to discuss their theoretical significance, and to suggest possibilities for further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HD 80-100 | - Discussion provides a very thorough exploration of the implications of the findings for all relevant theoretical perspectives  
- The candidate provides a full discussion of hypotheses in the light of findings and does not go beyond or downplay the significance of the data  
- Candidate is appropriately critical of the design and method, neither downplaying nor overstating problems. Where there are problems, the candidate indicates how they may be avoided in future and may even give details of an improved design  
- The discussion of future research directions is insightful and reflects a thorough understanding of key issues |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D 70-79 | Any issues raised in the Introduction are revisited and addressed  
|         | The discussion section draws together and summarises the main points  
|         | The candidate provides a discussion of the fate of hypotheses  
|         | Discussion provides an exploration of the meaning of findings but may not give full attention to all relevant theoretical issues  
|         | The conclusions drawn in the discussion are reasonable, accurate and follow from the results obtained. They serve to clarify and explain the results to the reader  
|         | The candidate makes a successful effort to examine his/her own research for methodological/statistical weaknesses and to suggest improvements  
|         | The candidate suggests future research directions. This is logical and well targeted |
| Cr 60-69 | An effort is made to present the findings and discuss their meaning  
|         | The significance of the findings for relevant theoretical perspectives is addressed but in a limited fashion. The candidate may not demonstrate a full understanding of the issues  
|         | New and unexpected theoretical perspectives or issues are presented in the discussion  
|         | The candidate may draw some conclusions that are not warranted, or that s/he has no real evidence for  
|         | The candidate may fail to emphasise the strengths of the study, or may overstate or ignore the significance of obvious weaknesses  
|         | The candidate accurately points out limitations of the study but does not recommend how these may be remedied |
| P 50-59 | The candidate provides a descriptive rather than an analytical account of the findings  
|         | Conclusions drawn are wrong in parts  
|         | The discussion may target hypotheses but represents a clear attempt to ‘push’ a one-sided interpretation of findings |
| F ≤49   | The discussion of findings is overwhelmingly wrong or too brief to be useful |
### Criterion 5: Structure of the argument, clarity and elegance of expression, and adherence to APA guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HD 80-100</strong></td>
<td>- The main points are developed logically. The reader quickly gains the sense of a developing ‘story’ that is maintained throughout the thesis&lt;br&gt;- The candidate presents a clear and consistent argument through the thesis&lt;br&gt;- The writing is fluent (e.g., paragraphs and sentences are well constructed and follow logically on from each other)&lt;br&gt;- Correct grammar and spelling are used&lt;br&gt;- The candidate demonstrates an excellent command of language. S/he writes in clear, plain English. The writing style is not overblown, verbose or unsophisticated&lt;br&gt;- Headings are clear and accurately describe the content that follows&lt;br&gt;- All sources are acknowledged correctly&lt;br&gt;- References and citations are presented in the appropriate format&lt;br&gt;- The thesis as a whole is presented neatly, using easily readable font and spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 70-79</strong></td>
<td>- The main points are developed logically and, taken together, present a coherent picture&lt;br&gt;- The argument is consistent – the candidate does not ‘change tack’ in the middle of the thesis&lt;br&gt;- The thesis is easy to read and generally flows well&lt;br&gt;- The writing is clear and can be read and understood with minimal effort&lt;br&gt;- Correct grammar and spelling are used, with a few minor exceptions&lt;br&gt;- Headings make sense and help to structure the thesis&lt;br&gt;- All sources are acknowledged correctly&lt;br&gt;- References and citations are presented in the appropriate format&lt;br&gt;- The thesis as a whole is presented neatly, using easily readable font and spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr 60-69</strong></td>
<td>- The thesis is structured as a psychology report and material is categorised under the correct headings&lt;br&gt;- The candidate makes a clear effort to present a logical argument&lt;br&gt;- The argument, or material presented to support the argument, may not be consistent throughout the theses e.g., The candidate may present key theoretical material in the discussion that did not appear in the Introduction or vice versa&lt;br&gt;- Although main points are clear the thesis is difficult to understand at times, either due to poor sentence/paragraph construction or due to a lack of structure in the argument as a whole&lt;br&gt;- Grammar and spelling are wrong in places – the thesis does not have a ‘polished’ feel to it&lt;br&gt;- Headings help to structure the thesis but may not be written clearly or may not be well chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P 50-59 | - The candidate makes an effort to use appropriate referencing but clear errors creep in  
- References and citations contain some errors but are presented a consistent format  
- The thesis as a whole is presented as a psychology report and each section contains relevant information  
- The candidate has made an effort to structure the thesis around some core issues but the argument as a whole may be quite difficult to grasp  
- The thesis is difficult to read as a whole and contains consistent and obvious errors in grammar and spelling  
- The candidate has used a consistent but incorrect format for referencing (e.g., Uses a style usually employed for a history rather than a psychology thesis) |
| F ≤49  | - The candidate may have failed to structure the thesis as a psychology report  
- It is difficult to discern any coherent argument  
- The writing style is confusing and the thesis as a whole is extremely difficult to read  
- The thesis contains no references or citations |
Honours Supervisor’s Form
Research School of Psychology

Student Name:

Thesis Title:

The supervisors’ report on an Honours student should provide information about the student’s Honours year that is not necessarily evident from the thesis, but is relevant to the decision-making process of the examiners and the School Examiners’ Committee. Supervisors should submit their reports to the Honours Convenor and Honours Administrative Committee within five days following their Honours students’ theses submission. Note that the supervisors do not contribute to the grading of the thesis and may not advocate a grade or mark. Supervisors are not required to be present for the determination of the final grade and mark at the School Examiners’ Committee.

Please comment on:

The nature of project (theoretical, applied, etc.).

The independence shown by the student in developing the topic, carrying out the research and analysing and interpreting the results.

The degree to which the student exhibited critical thinking.
Data type (student collected; shared data collection; secondary data analysis). Please give details. In case of shared data collection, what is the percentage of the data collected by the student?

Editorial assistance (e.g., the number of drafts that you have read; the amount of help with writing that the student got from you and others?)

Field-specific areas of which the examiners should be mindful (e.g., related to research methods, statistical analysis, etc.)?

Any special circumstances that affected the student’s work (Do not list here any circumstances for which the student requested an extension or special consideration).

Your willingness to accept this candidate as a PhD student, should they wish to study further.
Guide timeline for completion of research project
Also refer to the milestone requirements above.

**January - February**
- Students meet with Supervisor to discuss project

**February to April**
- Develop research question and hypotheses
- Prepare initial review of relevant literature
- Design research tools (questionnaires etc.)
- Submit ethics proposal to ANU Ethics Committee and any other relevant ethics committee.

**April**
- Finalise research instruments so that experiment is ready to go when ethics approval is given

**May**
- Present research aims and design to staff panel in early May
- Continue review and write up of the literature. You should aim to have a draft Introduction section written by the beginning of second semester
- Write up Method section of the research report (thesis)

**June / July**
- Run study and analyse data
- Present the Progress Report
- Begin write up of Results and Discussion sections of the research report

**August / September**
- Update Literature review
- Complete first draft of thesis
- Give draft research report to supervisor (September)

**October**
- Polish research report, taking into account feedback from Supervisor

**October**
- End of semester, submit thesis for examination
Libraries
The ANU collection is located in several buildings, each of which houses a collection focusing on one broad discipline. Material of most relevance to psychology can be found in the Chifley (Arts) and Hancock (Science) libraries. However, depending upon your interests, you may also consult the Law Library, Menzies library and/or the library at the John Curtin School of Medical Research.

The National Library may also be a valuable source of material. The library aims to stock all material published in Australia. You will be able to borrow books for a period of several hours, however you are unable to take material from the building. Photocopiers are available, but be prepared with change to purchase photocopy cards. The National Library is located in Parkes Place, Barton, near Old Parliament House.

Meeting and Work Room
Honours students have their own meeting and work room, which is located in the Peter Baume building (Room 2.08). The Honours room will be available from the start of the semester. There will be a number of shared computers. Students can access them using their ANU login.

Photocopying
Students have access to a photocopier, located in the resource room, in the Peter Baume building (Room 2.09). The photocopiers and printers are not intended for large scale printing requirements. See below for printing questionnaires and surveys.

Keys
A key to the Honours room and student resources room will be given out for your use this year at the Orientation session. They will be available from the Enquiries Office after this date. Entry into the building after-hours is via your student card. You must return your key to the office when you hand in your thesis at the end of your degree.

Printing Questionnaires and Surveys
Survey and questionnaire printing costs are deducted from the research budget which the Research School of Psychology allocates to you for your Honours research. To have questionnaires printed at the ANU Print office, please contact the Enquiries Office. No action can be taken until you have received approval from your Supervisor. Completed print jobs will be returned to the Psychology Enquiries Office for you to collect. You must allow at least two working days for work to be returned. Some jobs will take 3 – 4 days and appropriate time should be allowed.

Research Funds
Research funds are available for each Honours student of up to $350 per year, subject to change, and can be used for recognised research-related expenditure (e.g., if required to pay participants, buy equipment, or pay for specialised technical advice). If you wish to access these funds please contact the Enquiries Office.

Statistical Advice
If you need statistical advice, you should seek it from the statistical advisors listed earlier in this Handbook. It is also wise to think closely about how you will analyse your data at the time that you design your study (rather than after you have collected the data!), so do not leave it too late to seek advice if you and your Supervisor think you need to do so.
**Academic Skills and Learning Centre**
The people at this Centre can help you with studying and can also read drafts of your work.
Administration: (02) 6125 2972
Fax: (02) 6125 3399
E-mail: academicskills@anu.edu.au

Academic Skills and Learning Centre
Level 2, John Yencken Building 45
Sullivans Creek Road
http://www.anu.edu.au/students/contacts/academic-skills-learning-centre

**University Counselling Service**
This service is free for students, and is located immediately above the Health Service on North Road (near the Coffee Grounds Cafe). Telephone on 6125 2442 (Ext 52442).
http://www.anu.edu.au/students/health-wellbeing/counselling

**University Health Service**
The ANU Health Service is a fully accredited Primary Health Care Facility. It has both male and female General Practitioners and Registered Nurses.
Ground floor, Sports Union Building, North Road, ANU Campus Building 18
http://www.anu.edu.au/students/contacts/health-service

**Opening Hours**
9:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday to Thursday
9:00 am to 4:00 pm on Friday
(Closed 12:30 - 1:25 & Public holidays)

Contact: Front Desk (+61) 02 - 6125 3598 (internal extension 53598)
Nurse (+61) 02 - 6125 9695 (internal extension 59695) (between 2pm and 4pm weekdays)
Facsimile: (+61) 02 - 6125 0069
**APPENDIX A: AVAILABLE SUPERVISORS, THEIR RESEARCH INTERESTS, AND THEIR SUPERVISORY STYLES**

Anne Aimola Davies  
anne.aimola@anu.edu.au

Please contact the supervisor directly to learn about her projects and supervisory style.

Rhonda Brown  
rhonda.brown@anu.edu.au

The preferred research project topic is the relationship between interoception (i.e. awareness of bodily sensations, e.g. autonomic arousal & gut symptoms, etc.) and emotion states including anxiety, depression, impaired sleep, and empathy.  
My supervisory style is supportive. I maintain regular contact with research students, including face-to-face and email contact, especially during the early and later phases of the year. I help students to develop a research timeline, and my supervisory expectations are based on the mutually agreed timeline. I can help students to choose a research topic but would prefer them to develop their own research project, with supervisory guidance and support.

Alison Calear  
alison.calear@anu.edu.au

My broad areas of research interest are youth mental health, e-health and the prevention of anxiety, depression and suicide (including stigma and mental health literacy). I would be happy to support a project in one of these areas.

Generally, I like to work collaboratively with my students on the development of a research project and throughout the research process. I tend to meet with my students on a fortnightly basis and am contactable via email as needed. I expect students to drive their own research, with support, and to complete all discussed tasks between meetings.

I currently supervise 3 PhD students and have supervised to completion seven PhD students, two Honours students and 6 medical students. I'm happy to talk to students who may have questions via email (Alison.Calear@anu.edu.au) or phone (61258406).

Bruce Christensen  
bruce.christensen@anu.edu.au

**Research Area Overview:**

I often describe my research area as “cognitive psychopathology”. In broad terms, I am interested in the cognitive and neurobiological mechanisms of mental illness, with an emphasis on psychotic and affective disorders. However, my lab has also studied participants with anxiety disorders, traumatic
brain injuries, eating disorders and forensic histories. Several of our studies rely on evolutionary models of functional brain organization to generate neurocognitive hypotheses and, when possible, neuroimaging techniques (including MRI, PET, EEG/ERP, TMS) to investigate hypothesized neural correlates. We have studied the impact of mental illness on visual-perception, attention, memory/meta-memory, face processing, judgment/decision making, and cognition-emotion interactions and whether these abnormalities underwrite the clinical symptoms or functional disability associated with mental illness. I am also an active clinician (clinical psychology and neuropsychology) and devote some of my time to studying psychometric and pragmatic issues relating to clinical assessment. More recently, I have used a set of multivariate statistical tools (borrowed from market research) to better understand the needs and preferences of mental health clients in relation to service delivery. We have also used these same techniques to study what characteristics students prefer in supervisors and which aspects of mental illness most influence prejudice from others. Below are some more specific examples of previous honours projects completed under my supervision.

1. Testing a dynamic model of biased attention to threat in anxiety
2. Reasoning, delusion proneness and data gathering biases
3. The effect shifting criterion has on affect: Its reduction and exacerbation
4. The Impact of Confidence on Memorial Decisions Amongst Individuals High on Negative Affectivity
5. Great expectations: The influence of prior information on hallucinations
6. Attentional bias variability in anxiety: Is contextual processing a missing piece of the puzzle?

Amy Dawel  
amy.dawel@anu.edu.au

In real life, we often see facial expressions that signal genuine emotion (e.g., smiling in response to a pleasant event), but also expressions that are posed to symbolize emotion for other social reasons (e.g., smiling to be polite). Regrettably, the science of facial expressions has relied on facial expression stimuli that are artificially posed to fit into one of six or so “basic emotion” categories. These highly structured stimuli fail to capture the wide variety of expressive facial behaviour we see in our daily lives, and are rarely perceived as expressing genuine emotion. Similarly, there has been a recent trend to investigate “emotion” processing using artificial, computer-generated stimuli. Our lab team is working on understanding how people respond to genuine compared to posed expressions, and also computer-generated faces compared to real faces.

In 2019, I will be offering the following Honours project topics:

1. **Does the brain respond to computer-generated faces as though they are “real” (i.e., human) faces?** This project will involve learning to collect and analyse EEG data, and is suited to students who have good attention to detail, and mathematical/technical aptitude.
2. **Developing and validating a database of naturalistic expression stimuli.** This project will involve sourcing naturalistic expressions of emotion from the internet, testing human perceptions of these expressions, and examining how the output of “face-reading” software maps onto human percepts.
3. Cross-race perception of naturalistic expressions. This project will involve sourcing naturalistic expressions of emotion from two different races of face (Caucasian, Asian) and testing percepts of emotion authenticity across Caucasian and Asian participants.

Regarding supervision, my focus is on developing individual students, but also a lab group who provide a supportive community for one another. I meet with my students individually (or in pairs if on related projects) most weeks, and also expect them to attend a weekly lab team meeting during semester time (e.g., we might discuss an important journal article, or how to put together parts of your thesis). I aim for Honours projects to be conducted to a publishable standard, and past projects have contributed to successful publications. My goals are to challenge students to push the boundaries on their development, and support them to grow both intellectually and personally through this process. I value open and respectful communication in our lab.

If you are interested in working with me, please organise to meet with me so that we can discuss supervision and potential research projects in more detail.

Tegan Cruwys
tegan.cruwys@anu.edu.au

I am a clinical psychologist who conducts research on social identity and group processes in health (especially mental health).

In 2019, I will be supervising two projects broadly on these topics. Students with an interest in the intersection of health, clinical, and social psychology are encouraged to contact me for more information. Honours students will be able to collaboratively contribute to the design of experiments to explore how shared group membership affects our mental and physical health.

Students under my supervision will need to be available on site for intensive experimental data collection, particularly in May and August. Students will be expected to attend weekly lab group meetings and work collaboratively as part of a research team.

In terms of my supervisory style, I prefer regular weekly meetings, dropping back to fortnightly when appropriate. I like to provide students with enough independence that they have a chance to "own" their projects and develop their research skills, while also providing a safety net for when things go wrong. I prefer the term "advisor" to supervisor, as I think it captures the nature of this relationship a bit better - I won’t be looking over your shoulder directing everything you do, but I will be available to provide support with all aspects of your project as you ask for it. I like to work collaboratively to set deadlines that will keep your progress on track.

Mark Edwards
mark.edwards@anu.edu.au

Vision is fundamental to our ability to interact with the world. Additionally, a great deal of our understanding of how the brain works is based on our knowledge of how it processes visual information. The fundamental aim of my research is to further our understanding of how the brain processes visual information, from low to high (i.e. visual-cognition) levels. This includes understanding how it is affected in clinical settings, e.g. depression. My research and interests cover all aspects of visual perception and cognition and how they apply to real-world settings and clinical situations.

While I am happy to supervise students in most areas of visual perception and cognition, some of my active topics that are suitable for honours research are:
- How visual selective visual-attentional mechanisms affect the different visual pathways, e.g. magnocellular vs parvocellular and dorsal vs ventral.
- How various pathways are differentially pooled in motion processing.
- Binding problem in perception. We have multiple cortical areas that process different aspects of the visual scene, and so a question that results from that is how are these visual attributes recombined to form a coherence percept? One possible mechanism is temporal synchrony, and I have developed a motion stimulus that allows us to investigate this issue.
- Altered visual processing in near-hand space. A number of studies have shown that our perception of objects is altered when our hands are placed near them, compared to when our hands are placed away from the objects. This altered perception appears to be due to differential activation of magnocellular and parvocellular pathways under these two conditions. The exact reasons why this occurs and the extent to which the manner in which we interact with the objects can affect this process still needs to be determined.
- Along with Michael Platow and Stephanie Goodhew, we are developing studies that will investigate how visual attention allocation can be affected by membership of social groups. These studies could provide one of the mechanisms that maintain group membership and identity.

**Supervisory style and expectations**

I fully appreciate how demanding the honours year is, and also how important it is to students. Consequently, I am focused on helping my students obtain the best outcome they can achieve. In order to do that, I provide a structured and supportive environment. I don’t expect students to have a fully formed idea of what research they want to do in honours. If you do have ideas that will lead to an excellent honours thesis, that is great, but in most cases students do topics that I guide them towards. In return, I expect students to be highly motivated and work hard to achieve their goals. They also need to be able to take on board constructive feedback. Finally, to further encourage a supportive and intellectually active environment, Stephanie Goodhew and myself run weekly lab meetings with PhD, clinical and honours students.

**Stephanie Goodhew**

stephanie.goodhew@anu.edu.au

**Current research interest:** attentional flexibility. For most people, vision is the primary sensory modality, allowing us to navigate through the world and interact with it. It is our means of driving safely through traffic, avoiding obstacles, perceiving food we want to eat, reading, and recognising the face of a loved one. But at any given moment, there is far more information available to process in visual scenes than our brain is capable of processing to the level of awareness. This means that visual attention has a fundamental triaging role to play in shaping our perception of the world, by selecting certain relevant information for privileged processing, while filtering out other information. In many real-world visual tasks, the size of the spatial area over which we apply our attentional resources is important. For example, when driving a car, reading the speedometer requires a narrow focus of spatial attention, whereas monitoring the road for any movement (e.g., child approaching the road, trajectories of other cars) requires a broad focus. Similarly, when watching a crowd of people, recognising an individual face requires a narrow focus of attention, while determining the direction in which the majority of the crowd is moving requires a broader one.

Laboratory research has confirmed that different attended-region sizes benefit different aspects of visual perception. For example, a narrow attended-region enhances perceptual acuity for fine spatial details, whereas a wide one facilitates visual search over multiple diverse objects. Crucially, the fact
that different attended-region sizes are variably optimal for particular tasks implies that to successfully support dynamic and complex real-world vision, a critical task is not just to set a size for spatial attention, but to be able to flexibly alter (i.e., switch) this size in a rapid and efficient fashion. I am interested in studying this process of flexible attentional re-sizing from a number of different perspectives: contextual factors that influence efficiency of re-sizing (e.g., impact of a person’s mood), individual differences in flexibility of resizing (e.g., impact of ageing), and whether training can enhance the efficiency of resizing.

**Supervisory Style and Expectations** My supervisory style is best characterised as contractual according to Gatfield’s (2005) framework. This entails the provision of high structure and high support – which the evidence suggests is the most effective style (Gatfield, 2005). I strive to provide students with an environment that is intellectually challenging but interpersonally warm and supportive. I expect students to: be motivated to produce high-quality research, and to be receptive to constructive feedback in the service of doing so. I also expect students engage in the broader intellectual environment of the Visual Cognition Lab, which is to their benefit. I do not expect students to commence Honours with a fully-formed research idea (although would welcome it if you did).


**Elinor McKone**
elinor.mckone@anu.edu.au

Professor Elinor McKone's lab: Improving face identity and expression recognition in the bionic eye and age-related macular degeneration.

**Background and 2019 honours projects.** People with age-related macular degeneration (AMD) see faces as blurry. People fitted with bionic eyes also see faces in low resolution (as a grid of separated points of light). This makes it hard to recognise who people are, and to see their facial expressions. The problems seeing faces can result in difficulty in social interactions, such as unintentionally ignoring friends you didn't recognise, saying hello to someone you don't actually know, or not realising a friend has been offended by something you said. This can lead to people avoiding social situations, reduced social confidence, and reduced quality of life.

The aim of my research is to develop and test methods to improve ability to see faces in AMD and the bionic eye. To date, we have successfully demonstrated improvements using face *caricaturing*, based on the theory of face-space coding of faces (e.g., for AMD see Irons et al, 2014 in Journal of Vision; and for bionic eye see Irons et al, 2017 in Vision Research). We have shown it works for own-race face and other-race faces, in young adults and older adults, and in real AMD patients (as well as simulations of AMD and the bionic eye in normal-vision observers). We have shown it works for both face identity and face expression recognition. In 2018 honours projects, we also demonstrated success of a second method, *whole-part switching*. This is switching between seeing the whole face and expanded up local parts, and is based on the theory of holistic processing (and part-based processing) of faces (e.g., see Robbins & McKone, 2007 in Cognition; or McKone & Yovel, 2009 in Psychonomic Bulletin & Review).

In 2019, honours projects offered by my lab will be on this general topic. The projects will be primarily applied in nature (i.e., the aim is to test whether a certain manipulation of face images will actually help people), but will also involve a reasonable degree of theoretical meat concerning face-space coding and/or holistic and part-based coding. The projects may involve using eyetracking (e.g., to allow observers to 'scan' their bionic eye around the face they are looking at), so you will gain technical skills in that area.
Supervisory approach. I see honours projects as genuine research which should be aimed at leading to publishable results. The advantage of this for students is that I keep a close eye on the details of the experimental design and implementation, so my students have never ended up in a situation in which they have discovered a flaw in their method during the write-up stage when it is too late to fix! Many of my previous honours students have had their experiment/s included in publications or, in the case of students wanting to go on to a PhD, written up their honours work themselves for a first-author paper. I am happy to accommodate the intellectual and practical needs of students who want to become researchers, and equally those who want to become clinicians. The honours projects available are grant-funded (by the Australian Research Council), which means that equipment and money for paying participants is available.

Supervision will be joint, between Prof Elinor McKone and Dr Rachel Robbins, a postdoc in the lab. Elinor will be overseeing the project, and Rachel will be providing much of the everyday supervision. We would expect weekly meetings as the default for most of the year, with some variation (e.g., less when you are happily off collecting data, more when you are analysing the data and writing up).

Richard O’Kearney
richard.okearney@anu.edu.au

Please contact the supervisor directly to learn about his projects and supervisory style.

Dave Pasalich
dave.pasalich@anu.edu.au

1) My research interests:
How can we best support children so they develop along a healthy trajectory and achieve their full potential? Although there are many important factors involved in raising healthy children (a quick google search will reveal millions of ideas!), findings from a large body of research suggest that emotional support from key caregivers—including birth, kin and foster parents—is vital for promoting children’s wellbeing. In this light, my research focuses on parent-child relationships as sources of risk or resilience for developmental outcomes in children and adolescents. To date, my work has involved the families of children with behaviour problems (e.g., callous and aggressive behaviour) and children who have been exposed to early adverse experiences (e.g., maltreatment). To facilitate the interplay between scientific knowledge and community practice, I collaborate with community agencies—such as out-of-home-care services—to develop and evaluate the implementation of family-based programs to promote child wellbeing.

2) Research opportunities for Honours students:
Students in my research group conduct various theoretical and applied projects relating to risk and protective factors for antisocial behaviours and other mental health symptoms across the lifespan, such as oppositional behaviour in children and interpersonal violence (e.g., psychological abuse) in adults. I also supervise projects relating to developmental psychopathology in preschoolers (e.g., executive functioning, callous-unemotional features). If you’d like additional information you can email me for a list of thesis abstracts from my past students.

3) Supervisory style:
My main goals as a supervisor are to equip my students with the necessary skills for conducting quality, ethical, and collaborative research, and to develop their confidence in their own scholarly abilities. To these ends, I provide a style of supervision that is flexible and tailored to a student’s needs, and involves a blend of regular feedback and encouragement of student initiative. Honours
students also become members of the Child Wellbeing Research Group (http://psychology.anu.edu.au/research/groups/child-wellbeing-research-group) and have opportunities to discuss research and career interests with clinical psychology students in the group.

Michael Platow
michael.platow@anu.edu.au

Please contact the supervisor directly to learn about his projects and supervisory style.

Katherine Reynolds
katherine.reynolds@anu.edu.au

(1) 2019 honours projects

In 2019 I will be supervising 1-2 students co-supervised with the Department of Defence using data from Defence people management surveys to advise on improving organisational performance (for example Organisational change: What drives resistance and support?; Leadership Effectiveness: Investigating current models in a Defence context). This project is part of a Research Internship agreement between ANU and Department of Defenec. A wide range of constructs are assessed and there are a large number of participant responses. The use of secondary data is permitted and encouraged in Honours and the thesis is assessed in the same way as student-collected data.

Other projects relate to our multi-year School climate and school identification project with the ACT Department of Education. We have found perceptions of positive school climate and school identification are important in explaining school outcomes (academic achievement, well-being, bullying). We have also examined predictors of staff outcomes such as job satisfaction and stress. There are a range of new projects that can be developed with Honours students in areas of health, social, and educational psychology. It is also possible to develop laboratory based studies that explore some areas in more detail (e.g., learning, ways to build social identity). This education project is now broader also investigating the role of group norms and social identity in explaining attitude and behavior change. There are a range of experimental studies that are needed to develop more integrated models of behavior change.

I also lead a project on Strengthening social cohesion. We have found using a controlled design that community-lead programs can be effective in reducing prejudice and increasing willingness to stand up against instances of racism. Furthermore, it is the program norms related to acceptance of diversity and identification with the program and its leadership that explains these changes in attitudes and behaviour. There are additional projects that flow from these core findings that can be developed with Honours students.

Relevant references (happy to discuss further)


Bizumic, B., Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Bromhead, D. & Subasic, E. (2009). The role of the

(2) Supervisory style

Students learn differently and benefit from different supervisory styles. I have supervised over 40 students and the style has varied from highly structured weekly meetings to less structured approaches. I encourage students to write early to build familiarity with the material and to aid in structuring arguments in the context of existing theory and research. I think it is important to have a good working relationship with students where both parties feel they can raise issues and can benefit from open discussion.

Elizabeth Rieger
elizabeth.rieger@anu.edu.au

**Supervision Style**

I am to provide flexible supervision that is responsive to the diverse needs of students. I also aim to provide a highly supportive environment as students learn to master each phase of the research process – absorbing the relevant literature, research design, preparing relevant ethics applications, data collection, statistical analysis, and write-up of the project.

**Research Topics**

I supervise diverse research topics at the Honours level within the overarching category of ‘eating disorders and obesity’. Since most Honours students do not have clinical training, and due to the time constraints of data collection during the Honours year, my Honours students do not use clinical samples. Instead, they conduct research on topics relevant to eating disorders and obesity in community (usually university) samples. These studies typically utilise an experimental design in order to obtain information regarding causal mechanisms. Examples of topic areas that I have supervised in recent years are as follows:

1. Understanding the causes of stigma towards individuals with eating disorders and obesity, and developing interventions to reduce stigma
2. Understanding the interpersonal factors that trigger eating disorder symptoms and in which vulnerable groups
3. Understanding the cognitions (e.g., motivation to change) and deficits in information processing (e.g., attentional biases) associated with eating and body image concerns.

**Contact Details:** Please contact me at Elizabeth.Rieger@anu.edu.au if you would like further information.

Brett Scholz
brett.scholz@anu.edu.au

**Honours Projects**

As a Critical Health Psychologist, my research seeks to improve health systems, services and practices. Specifically, my focus is on the way that consumers of health services are not meaningfully involved in health service planning, implementation, delivery, and evaluation to the extent required by policy. This is of particular concern given that a) consumers have a right to be part of decisions and processes that impact them, and b) meaningful consumer involvement leads to services that are more relevant, reputable, and safe.
I am available to supervise Honours projects that deal with any issues about health service improvement, particularly through improved consumer involvement. My expertise is in qualitative methods and discursive psychology, so I encourage students to think about how these methods might inform their work. Such projects could tie in with any questions aligned with my overall research project such as:

a. How are health professionals currently dealing with policy requirements to collaborate with consumers at all levels and stages of service planning, implementation, delivery, and evaluation?

b. How do particular health professions overcome traditionally paternalistic attitudes towards consumer involvement (e.g. mental health, or palliative care in which consumers are assumed to not have capacity/drive to collaborate)

c. Research has addressed ways in which allies (non-consumers who support the goals of the consumer movement) can champion consumer collaboration, but less is known about what such allies ‘get’ out of the alliance. However, less is known about what the benefits are for allies working with consumers.

Some of my recent work that might be relevant in formulating research questions includes:


**Supervisory Style**

My approach to Honours supervision is as a research collaborator. So while the project will be led by the Honours student, I do what I can to advise and guide the project such that it will be a publishable manuscript at the end of the year that will be of interest to psychologists, consumers, and other stakeholders across health disciplines. Although my background is in Psychology, I have experience working and researching in Medicine, Nursing and Midwifery, and Public Health. The majority of my Honours students have had their thesis work published in journals from various health disciplines such as *Health Psychology* or the *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*.

I meet with students for an hour each week, but this can be flexible such that, for example, we spend less time meeting during periods of data collection, and more time during periods of data analysis.
1. Supervision style

My goals of supervision are transmitting essential research skills, extending students’ thoughts and helping students become independent in research. As a supervisor, I aim to help my students develop appropriate research projects and develop their skills of managing research projects. Students are highly encouraged to come up with their own research ideas/projects, to learn new skills during the project, and to take lead on every part of the research project.

Communication: Students should expect regular communication with me including regular face-to-face, structured meetings and email communication. Students are welcome to email me when they have new ideas or need help, and I will aim to reply emails in a timely manner.

Research management: I will help the student develop appropriate programs and timeline of research at the beginning of the project. I expect the student to be highly self-motivated and to follow the proposed timeline. Students are expected to read the Honours program guideline to be familiar with the course structure and required milestones. In addition, students are encouraged to start writing different sections of the thesis gradually throughout the project.

2. Choice of Topics

I am interested in supervising projects of which the topics, theoretical framework or methodology are in my expertise. My current main research interest/areas:

1) Judgment and decision making under uncertainty;
2) Measuring attitudes toward ambiguity in decision making;
3) Cross-cultural differences in attitudes toward uncertainty.

Some example projects are available at: https://goo.gl/GYh77P

Michael Smithson

michael.smithson@anu.edu.au

Supervisory Style

I regard an Honours thesis project as primarily the student’s project, not mine. So, my main goal as a thesis supervisor is to give the student the best chance that I can, of fully demonstrating their capabilities, skills, and creativity in a research project of their choosing. To achieve this goal, I try to enable each student to work as independently as is feasible for them. I suggest topics for project that I’m able to supervise (see the list below) and then help the student find a project that inspires them but also is within their capabilities (and mine!).

I reserve an hour-long weekly time-slot for each Honours student, so that they have at least one guaranteed meeting with me per week, but of course this does not mean they’re required to meet with me every week if they don’t need to. I help out mainly where the student is stuck or is having to work on parts of the thesis that don’t correspond to their strengths. Also, where possible I orient my supervisory style and expectations according to the student’s interests and career goals.

Project Topics (in no particular order)

Topic 1: Uncertainty Arising from Conflict and/or Ambiguity

A line of research, initiated by Smithson (1999), has demonstrated that people distinguish between uncertainty arising from ambiguous information and uncertainty arising from conflicting information. There are several potential Honours projects in this topic.

Topic 2: Cross-Cultural Generality of Biases and Heuristics in Judgements and Decisions Under Uncertainty
A joint research project initiated by Smithson and Dr Jianmin Zeng of SouthWest University in Chongqing is underway, comparing Australian and Chinese student samples regarding their responses to several classic experimental tasks from the “heuristics and biases” research on judgement and decision making under uncertainty.

**Topic 3: Judgements Regarding Human Extinction and Existential Threats**
There is a small but growing literature of investigations into public beliefs about the prospect of human survival and threats to it. Smithson and Shou (2017) found a “disjunction fallacy” committed by 76% and 84% of respondents, whereby respondents rated the probability of human extinction due to a specific threat as at least as high as the probability of human extinction *sui generis*. This phenomenon begs for an explanation and further exploration.

**Topic 4: How Big is (Sample) Space?**
We often have to make decisions when we don’t know what all of the alternatives or possible outcomes are—i.e., the sample space. There is some evidence that we tend to under-estimate its size. There also is evidence that our judgements about how likely any of the known outcomes are is influenced by the number of outcomes salient to us. Other than that, little is known about how humans form beliefs about the size and nature of a sample space when they receive information about it, such as a sample of data from its population.

**Topic 5: Quantile regression models for doubly-bounded dependent variables**
Smithson and Shou (2017) produced a new family of probability distributions for modeling doubly-bounded variables, developed estimation methods for it, and launched an R package (Shou & Smithson, 2018) to implement it. Much remains to be done, including applying it to modeling “compositional” data (i.e., where probabilities have to add up to 1).

**Topic 6: Measuring Confidence in Suspect Identification Tasks**
In police station line-ups for an eyewitness to identify a criminal suspect, eyewitness confidence ratings usually are 5- or 7-point ordinal scales with verbal labels. Wixted and Wells (2017) gloss over the issue of how best to measure confidence, in their review of how good a guide such ratings are for assessing eyewitness accuracy in identifying criminals.

**Lillian Smyth**

lillian.smyth@anu.edu.au

(1) **Anticipated 2019 honours projects:**

My research focuses on the social psychology of norms and behaviour change, but also extends into self-structure and education. In 2019, I have two key ongoing projects, in which students could be involved:

- Norms for self-structure: examining the roles of faith and culture in shaping the self-concept.
- Norms are stories we tell ourselves: Examining narrative-based normative interventions.

I am also open to student project ideas, in the social influence or education domains, but students will need to be flexible and rational about the need to whittle down big ideas to an honours-project scale.

(2) **Supervisory style:**

My supervisory style is largely a support role. At this level, I expect students to be able to take the lead on their own project, pursue ideas and actions independently and proactively seek help when they need it. I am happy to provide as much conceptual, methodological, research design, statistical and write-up guidance as necessary, but expect students to take charge of their own project and progress.
Dirk Van Rooy
dirk.vanrooy@anu.edu.au

Please contact the supervisor directly to learn about his projects and supervisory style.

Erin Walsh
erin.walsh@anu.edu.au

**Application of latent class analysis to longitudinal ageing data to identify individuals at risk of brain atrophy.** Although there is inevitably some degree of age-associated changes in brain volume, abnormal brain atrophy is associated with adverse outcomes ranging from mild cognitive impairment through to dementia and Alzheimer’s disease. This research project will involve examination of some of the demographic, health, and lifestyle factors which may impact on brain atrophy. A focus will be placed on change over time, which will be explored using latent class analysis techniques. A strong statistical background, and experience (or willingness to learn) coding and use of the statistical program R is recommended.

**Investigation of the shape of brain structures associated with schizophrenia.** The corpus callosum is the main pathway for neurons connecting the left and right brain hemispheres. The shape of the corpus callosum reflects the number and health of connections between the hemispheres, so it can be used to investigate lateralized processes and dysfunctions within the brain. **Structural abnormalities have been noted in the corpus callosum of individuals with schizophrenia.** In this project, students will design their own project around the application of cutting-edge shape analysis techniques to magnetic resonance images of human brains available from http://schizconnect.org/. No background in neuroimaging is required.

**Supervisory style:** student-directed, centring around regular weekly meetings.
APPENDIX B: WRITING AND HANDING IN YOUR THESIS

Writing Your Thesis

Your thesis should be written as a psychology research report. The major headings and what goes under them are outlined below. We do not expect you to adhere to any particular font size, but there are certain basic rules to follow associated with the content, broad structure and detail of the thesis. You should adhere to the stylistic conventions set out in the APA manual (5th edition).

Content

Your thesis must tell a story, in the sense that it must have a beginning, middle and an end. The information you present must be logically structured and give the reader the sense that he or she is progressing towards a greater understanding of the topic in general and of your own research in particular. Your thesis must be analytical and critical in nature - not just descriptive. The reader is looking for evidence that you understand your field, but also that you can identify strengths and weaknesses and gaps in knowledge or explanation or theory, and come up with a meaningful research project based on this understanding and analysis. Your study (hypotheses, design and method) must follow logically from your Introduction. The questions you are asking in your research and the measures you are using must make sense in the context of what has gone before in the Introduction. In general, your report should start out at a broad level, become narrower and focused in the presentation of your research, and then broaden out again by the end of your discussion.

Structure

Your section titles should look something like this:

Title page

Table of Contents

Abstract

Method

Participants and Design

Procedure

Results

Discussion

References

Appendix A (if necessary)

Appendix B (if necessary)
Table of Contents
This should list major and minor headings, with page numbers.

Title Page
The title page must be formatted in line with the example attached at the end of this Handbook.

Abstract
Your abstract should be presented as one paragraph of about 200 words (or less) and should allow the reader to quickly gain an overview of the contents of your report. Refer to the nature of the problem, the method you used, the results you found and the conclusions you came to. The abstract represents a micro-summary of the entire thesis.

Introduction
You should begin by introducing your topic - set the scene so that what follows is placed in context. Give the reader some idea of why this area is worthwhile pursuing. Then move fairly quickly to your review of the literature. Your Introduction should set out the relevant literature in enough detail so that the reader gains a clear and critical overview of past research (leading up to your own study). You may use sub-headings if it helps you to structure your intro. Make sure that your Introduction is divided up appropriately at both the paragraph and subheading level. Do not put a paragraph break in just because it looks nice – make sure it presents a new thought/concept/perspective/issue.

After reviewing the literature, your own work will take centre stage. At the end of your Introduction, you should have a section that orients the reader to your own research. Here you will outline your research aims/question(s), where these fit into the literature you have just critiqued, and any specific hypotheses. By this time, however, the focus you are taking in your research should be obvious to the reader, given that you have oriented them successfully in the rest of your intro. Your own work should appear to be a logical extension of what has gone before. This does not mean that you need to agree with what has gone before. Perhaps your research is going to provide us with a new insight into the shortcomings of past work and the direction we should be taking.

Method
This section tells the reader how the study was done. It contains subheadings. In general, they will look like this:

Participants and Design
Tell the reader how many participants you had and from where you got them. If relevant, tell the reader how many males and females you had (or any other relevant subgrouping). Outline the design of your experiment (participant selection, IVs and DVs) or the logical structure of your survey. What did you manipulate (if anything)? What did you measure?
**Procedure**
Here, you tell the reader what you did in sufficient detail so that the reader could repeat it fairly faithfully. Include brief instructions to participants (if they are long just summarise then put the rest in an Appendix). Other headings may be relevant to you (e.g., *Apparatus, Stimuli*).

**Results**
In this section you tell the reader what happened in your study. First, restate your hypotheses or the purpose of your study. Then describe your analysis of the data and the results of your analysis. Include tables and figures to the extent that they help the reader understand the data. Do not use figures indiscriminately, and *never* use a table or figure without discussing its contents in the text. Make sure that interpretation is easy. There will often be more than one way to describe your data – give plenty of thought to how best to get the message across. Be clear in your mind what the message actually is.

**Discussion**
In this section, tell the reader about why your results turned out the way they did. Tell the reader of the fate of your hypotheses or research question. Were they confirmed or disconfirmed? Why is this? Did you find support for one model or theory over another? Why is your interpretation the best one? How do the theories you told us about in the intro now stand up in the light of your own work? If your results have something to do with serious flaws, methodological problems, sampling error etc., tell us about it – but do not go to great lengths to discredit your own research if this is not warranted. Concentrate on (a) explaining your results and (b) explaining what they mean (if anything). Be careful not to actually go beyond your data (i.e., Do not suggest that your results tell us something when in fact there is no evidence for this). Do not introduce startling new theoretical approaches here – make sure that what you say makes sense in the light of the Introduction. Your discussion should move to a consideration of future research (your recommendations, etc.). End with a conclusion that wraps it all up. Again, you may use subheadings in this section if you wish.

**References**
Give details of all sources you cite. Have a look at any published articles to see how references should be presented. Italicise journal and book titles. There is a short guide to this in your course guide. Do not include refs that you have not cited in the main body of your thesis. And make sure that anything you have cited is included here.

**Appendices**
These contain details of instructions to participants, survey items you could not fit in your results, and statistical tables (details of analyses). Include a new appendix for each kind of info, on a new page.

**Finally –**
MAKE SURE YOUR PROOF-READ YOUR THESIS VERY CLOSELY

Format, Layout, Binding and Submitting Your Thesis
• Double or 1.5 space your work. Make sure that the font is big enough to read comfortably (e.g., 12 point Times with 1.5 spacing). Leave a margin on the left for binding (e.g., 3.5 on the left, 2.4 on other sides). The formatting and layout of your title page must follow the example given below.

• Your thesis should be submitted to the office as follows:
  ▪ A thesis submission form (available from the Enquiries Office).
  ▪ One unbound copy.
  ▪ The thesis should be doubled sided.
    Do this by going to File, Page Setup, In Margins, go to Multiple pages and select Mirror margins, then set the size of the margins (Left & Right).
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**APPENDIX C: EXAMPLES OF APA FORMAT**

**Quotations and In-text Citation:**

After extensive field observation, Cousteau (1996) concluded that the close social bonds evident within whale pods were “instrumental in driving the development of an extraordinary capacity for complex communication” (p. 158). However, Cutlass, Silver and Parrot (1999) dispute this point, arguing that the “whales’ capacity for complex communication unarguably facilitated the emergence of strong social bonds, and not vice versa as Cousteau (1996) claims” (p. 524). Contributing to the controversy, others dispute both Cousteau (1996) and Cutlass et al. (1999) and envisage a more interactive process (Robinson & Family, 1998).

**Tables**

Table 1

*Judgements of Fairness of Dismissal Procedure by Job Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dismissal Procedure</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Checkout staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification by mail</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Judgements were made on 10-point scales (1 = *completely unfair*, 10 = *completely fair*)
Figure 1. Judgements of fairness of dismissal procedure by job level.

Note. Judgements were made on 10-point scales (1 = completely unfair, 10 = completely fair)
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