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1 HONOURS ADMINISTRATION

1.1 SCHOOL CONTACTS

Honours Co-ordinator and Co-ordinator of Theoretical Thesis

Dr. Fiona Hibberd
Room 451 Brennan MacCallum (BM)
Phone 9351 2867
Email fiona.hibberd@sydney.edu.au

Deputy Honours Co-ordinator and Co-ordinator of Empirical Thesis

Dr. Irina Harris
Room 510 Griffith Taylor (GT)
Phone 9351 3497
Email irina.harris@sydney.edu.au

Honours Administrative Assistant

Ms. Julia Ashworth
Room 325 BM
Phone 9351 5751
Email julia.ashworth@sydney.edu.au

Please direct all administration inquiries to Julia Ashworth, all academic inquiries concerning the Empirical Thesis to Dr. Irina Harris, and all other academic inquiries to Dr. Hibberd.

You must check your university email address on a regular basis (or have it redirected to an address you do check). Email is the primary way we communicate with students. Important reminders and messages are often sent to your university email. Information about email forwarding can be found at:


Contact details for all School of Psychology staff can be found at the following URL:

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/phoneDB/dir_all.msql

Note the new style email address for staff: firstname.surname@sydney.edu.au

1.2 PSYCHOLOGY COUNTER

For administrative queries and the submission of forms and assignments, the Administration Office - Psychology counter is located on the ground floor of the Brennan MacCallum building. Opening hours may change depending on staffing and time of year, but the counter is usually open between 12:30 pm and 4pm, Monday to Friday.

The Honours Administrative Assistant (Julia Ashworth) is your contact for all administrative matters related to Honours. However, before sending an email or making a phone call to Julia, please check to see whether the information you need is either in this Handbook or on the web. The School of Psychology web page is at:


WebCT will be online from March 1, 2010.
2 PSYCHOLOGY HONOURS PROGRAMME

2.1 COURSE OBJECTIVES

The distinctive feature of the Psychology Honours programme at the University of Sydney is its critical approach to research and scholarship. Since its inception early last century, the School has valued and nurtured conceptual inquiry as well as empirical inquiry. The Honours programme is designed to develop and evaluate students’ ability to demonstrate conceptual clarity in theorizing and methodological clarity in the conduct of empirical research.

To achieve these broad objectives and to satisfy the Australian Psychological Society’s requirements for an accredited fourth year programme that completes “an integrated and comprehensive education in the discipline of psychology… [by providing] advanced level study in a range of areas and…advanced research training” (APS Accreditation Guidelines, October 2000, updated September 2002, p. 23), the Honours programme involves:

(i) the planning, conduct, and reporting of a substantial Empirical Research project;
(ii) the development and writing of either a Theoretical Thesis OR essays related to two Special Field seminars and other assessments;
(iii) the rounding out of scholarship, methodological understanding and critical analysis through lectures, seminars, and reading on a range of topics in Ethics and Research Methods.

2.2 COURSE STRUCTURE AND ASSESSMENT

The course is one academic year in duration and includes the following components:

a. Empirical Thesis (50%)  
Planning and implementation of a research project, under the supervision of a member of the university’s academic staff in Psychology, and presentation of this research project as a dissertation (9,000-12,000 words), due on Wednesday, 13 October, 2010.

b. Theoretical Thesis OR Special Fields coursework (30%)  

(i) The Theoretical Thesis option involves the development and writing of a Theoretical Thesis (max. 8,000 words), due by Monday, 26 July, 2010 at the latest.

OR

(ii) The Special Fields coursework option involves weekly attendance at two Special Fields seminars throughout semester 1 only and completion of the specified assessments for each seminar. These assessments are due on Monday, 14 June, 2010. SF assessment details are provided in Section 3.3.2.

c. Compulsory coursework (20%)

(i) Research Methods (15%)  
This course is held in Semester 1 only, and involves two components, each worth 7.5%.

The Statistics & Research Design (SRD) component involves 13 one hr. lectures and 12 one hr. tutorials, and is assessed by a 2 hour formal examination (held in the June examination period).

The Psychometrics component involves 10 one hr. lectures 7 and one hr. tutorial, and is assessed by a 2 hour formal examination (held in the June examination period).

(ii) Ethics (5%)  
This involves one lecture per week for the first 7 weeks of Semester 2 and is assessed by a 1.5 hour formal examination on Monday, 21 September, 2010 (week 9 of Semester 2).
d. **Supplementary coursework** (not assessed)

You are encouraged to attend:

(i) the School Research Colloquium (Friday 4pm, every week during semesters 1 and 2).
(ii) the Theory & Systems Special Field, **if you are completing the Theoretical Thesis option**.

The general assessment requirements and weighting of each of these components in the calculation of each student’s final Honours grade is summarised in the following table. The assessment procedures used to standardise and combine the component marks, and the processes used to assign Honours grades on the basis of the weighted scores, are described in Section 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Thesis</td>
<td>9000 - 12,000 words</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted for assessment by 2 independent examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Thesis OR</td>
<td>8,000 words</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>no later than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fields Seminars</td>
<td>Submitted for assessment by 2 independent examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. 4,000 words for each Seminar; major assignment</td>
<td>30% (15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submitted for assessment by 2 examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15% each Special Field Seminar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Formal 1.5 hr Examination in Week 9 of Semester 2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(subject to change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Two formal examinations (2 hrs and 1.5 hrs) in Semester 1 exam</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Exam period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>period</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 - 26 June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 CHOICE OF THEORETICAL THESIS OR SPECIAL FIELDS COURSEWORK

Students should note that the two options - Theoretical Thesis/Special Fields - differ in many respects. The thesis is best thought of as a large (8000 word) History & Philosophy of Psychology essay undertaken with the guidance of a supervisor and without the structure/constraints of weekly classes, presentations, etc. Special Fields students are required to attend these weekly classes and complete multiple, separate pieces of assessment, while Theoretical Thesis students are required to consult regularly with their supervisor and submit a single dissertation. Students should read carefully the sections relevant to the Theoretical Thesis and the Special Fields seminars, and reflect on their own interests, capabilities and preferred form of work when deciding which option is best suited to them. Contact Dr. Hibberd if you’re unsure and would like to discuss the two alternatives (fionah@psych.usyd.edu.au). **Note that you are no less likely to receive a good mark if you complete a Theoretical Thesis rather than the Special Fields option.** Students intending to do the Theoretical Thesis option should contact Dr. Hibberd as soon as possible.
2.4 WORKLOAD AND SCHEDULE FOR 2010

The Honours programme is very different in structure from your earlier undergraduate years. Although your studies are now concentrated in one School only and you have fewer class contact hours than in earlier years, the demands of the course are heavily concentrated into 8 months. Completing the programme effectively will require you to carefully plan a schedule that allows you to carry out the reading, scholarship and writing required for your coursework and Theoretical Thesis (if you take that option), while continuously working on your Empirical Thesis. Thus, more than any of your previous undergraduate years, the Honours programme will test your ability to organise efficiently and pace your workload to meet the various deadlines.

It is strongly recommended that you begin data collection for the Empirical Thesis in May-June.

The schedule below summarises the important dates for the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 25 February</td>
<td>Attend Information session: 10am – 1pm and 2 – 3pm in the Pharmacy Lecture Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 19 March (Week 3)</td>
<td>Special Fields Major Assignments available on web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 16 April</td>
<td>Last day to submit Empirical Thesis proposal and Ethics Declaration form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 14 June</td>
<td>Submit two Special Fields Major Assignments (use cover sheets provided on website).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams 14 – 26 June</td>
<td>Research Methods examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 5 July</td>
<td>Last day to submit Theoretical thesis draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 26 July (Week 1)</td>
<td>Last day to submit Theoretical Thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 21 September – subject to change (Week 9)</td>
<td>Ethics examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 1 October (non-teaching week)</td>
<td>Submit Empirical Thesis Progress Report confirming that drafts of introduction, method, and results have been submitted to Supervisor (Appendix E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 13 October (Week 11)</td>
<td>Submit Empirical Thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All required forms and assessable work must be submitted to the Psychology counter no later than 4pm on the date specified.
# 2.5 TIMELINE FOR EMPIRICAL RESEARCH THESIS

The empirical research project requires you to work consistently throughout the year. To help you plan this major component of your workload, the flowchart below specifies the various activities associated with conducting your empirical research project and suggests a general time frame. You should discuss this timeline with your supervisor in the light of the specific demands of your project. Plan a schedule that you endeavour to keep.

**From Early February**
- Arrange to meet with your supervisor to discuss your project
- Begin reading the material relevant to your proposed topic

**February - early April**
- Meet regularly with supervisor to:
  - Develop research questions and hypotheses
  - Discuss the literature you have read on the topic
  - Develop and refine research design
  - Write a draft of the Introduction to your thesis
  - Design research tools (e.g. questionnaires, experimental protocols etc)
  - Write a draft of the Method section to your thesis
  - Prepare Draft Research Proposal and submit to supervisor for feedback
  - Revise proposal on the basis of supervisor feedback and complete Ethics Declaration
  - Submit Ethics application to University Ethics Committee

**April - May**
- Submit Research Proposal and Ethics Declaration for review (**16 April**)
- Finalise research instruments and methods
- Discuss any issues raised by reviewer with supervisor and revise design/procedures if appropriate
- Pilot procedures
- Start conducting research study

**June - August**
- Continue conducting research
- Collate data and begin analyses
- Continue to review relevant literature
- Fine-tune Introduction and Method sections of thesis
- Begin draft of Results section

**Note:** the exact order in which you conduct these tasks will depend on the participants you are testing and their availability during the semester break.

**September**
- Finalise analysis
- Update literature review
- Prepare final draft of Introduction, Method and Results to submit to supervisor for feedback
- Begin to draft Discussion
- Prepare raw data and other materials for appendices

**October**
- Submit Empirical Research Progress Report confirming that Introduction, Method, Results have been submitted to Supervisor for feedback (**1 October**)
- Revise early thesis sections on the basis of supervisor’s feedback
- Finalise Discussion section (not to be read by supervisor)
- Write abstract
- Finalise appendices
- **PROOF-READ THESIS**
- Submit thesis before 4pm, 13 October
- 4.01pm, 13 October – CELEBRATE at the Manning Bar
3 COURSEWORK DETAILS

3.1 COURSEWORK TIMETABLE


3.2 COMPULSORY COURSEWORK

3.2.1 RESEARCH METHODS

This course consists of two components.

A. Statistics & Research Design (SRD)

Thirteen one-hour lectures and 12 one hour tutorials in Semester 1. See Honours notice board for tutorial allocations.

Co-ordinator
Dr. Margaret Charles
BM 452
9351 3354
margaret.charles@sydney.edu.au

Other teaching staff
Dr Fiona Hibberd
BM 451
9351 2867
fiona.hibberd@sydney.edu.au

General Description

The aim of this course is to expand the menu of statistical tools available to students for their research, whether survey-based, observational or experimental, and to develop their understanding of the conceptual bases of these tools. Tutorials will involve computer work using SPSS, while at the same time reinforcing the concepts discussed in lectures. It is assumed that students are familiar with material covered in PSYC2012 and PSYC3010 (including analysis of variance, contrasts and multiple regression).

It is recommended that students purchase a copy of SPSS Graduate Pack (NOT the Student version) from the Co-Op bookshop. The Graduate pack is a fully-functioning version with a 4 year licence. Note that version 18 for Mac and PC is the latest version, but earlier versions are also adequate. (If buying earlier versions, check version/operating system compatibility.) Times will also be available in the School’s computer labs for student use of SPSS.

Teaching outcomes

- an understanding of the empirical meaning of parameters in statistical models
- an understanding of experimental design issues: control of unwanted variability, confounding and bias, increasing power with covariate control
- understanding of indices of effect size and issues in power analysis
- ability to use dummy coding and contrast coding to test statistical hypotheses within the General Linear Model
- an ability to apply design/statistical concepts in students’ individual research projects
- an ability to analyse data and interpret output in a scientifically meaningful way
- an understanding of the limitations and shortcomings of statistical models, packages, and inferences

Syllabus

Conceptual topics covered include: measurement in Psychology, the empirical meaning of parameters in statistical models, scientific control, the meaning of ‘interaction’ and ‘effect size statistics’; conceptual issues relating to probability and null hypothesis significance testing

Statistical models discussed include: Multiple Linear Regression (MLR), ANOVA and ANCOVA for between-subjects, within-subjects, and mixed designs, Logistic Regression.

The course will have a “critical” slant, aimed at examining what the statistical tools do and do not offer.
Assessment

Two-hour examination in the Semester 1 exam period, part multiple choice, part short answer written questions.

Lecture/tutorial outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Seminars</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Measurement: conceptual issues (I)</td>
<td>No tutorial</td>
<td>Dr Fiona Hibberd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple regression and the GLM</td>
<td>Revision: GLM</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multifactor studies: 2 &amp; 3 way anova and contrasts</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effect size and power analysis</td>
<td>Multifactor anova + contrasts</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Categorical variables in regression: dummy variable coding and ancova</td>
<td>Effect size; power analysis</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MID-SEMESTER BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Categorical variables in regression: contrast coding</td>
<td>Dummy variable coding; ancova</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interaction in regression: categorical and continuous variables</td>
<td>Contrast coding</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interaction in regression: two continuous variables</td>
<td>Interaction (1)</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Repeated measures analyses &amp; contrasts</td>
<td>Interaction (2)</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Repeated measures (1)</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Conceptual issues: Probability and NHST</td>
<td>Repeated measures (2)</td>
<td>Dr Fiona Hibberd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logistic regression (1)</td>
<td>Dr Fiona Hibberd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logistic regression (2)</td>
<td>Dr Fiona Hibberd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information will be available on WebCT and in lectures and tutorials. Most tutorials will have associated pre-tutorial work that will be available on WebCT. Completion of the pre-tutorial exercises will assist in developing your understanding of the relevant material.

Recommended readings and references will be provided.

A resource for students wishing to revise undergraduate statistics can be accessed via your WebCT login. Under 2010 HPsychM Master of Applied Science you will find a series of optional multiple choice quizzes on issues relevant to psychological research and statistical analysis that have been made available to you.

B. **Psychometric Principles and Applications**

10 one-hour lectures and 7 one-hour tutorials in Semester 1.

**Teaching staff**

Dr Sabina Kleitman  
BM 441  
9351 7703  
sabina.kleitman@sydney.edu.au

Dr Fiona Hibberd  
BM 451  
9351 2867  
fiona.hibberd@sydney.edu.au

Dr Carolyn MacCann  
BM 449  
9351 4236  
carolyn.maccann@sydney.edu.au
General Description

The aim of this course is to expose students to the operational and methodological details involved in non-experimental research, particularly as they pertain to psychometric tests. Students will learn scale development techniques involving item analyses, interpretations of factor analytic techniques and Item Response theory (IRT). Tutorials range from practical demonstrations of measurement techniques to discussions of the changing conceptualisations of reliability and validity.

Lectures on test standards will cover the basic professional standards governing psychometrics, including the evaluation of reliability, validity, fairness in testing, applications in testing, and testing individuals from diverse backgrounds. Students will be introduced to IRT as an alternative to classical test theories of measurement, and to some applications of item response theory in intelligence and aptitude testing.

Teaching outcomes

- an ability to evaluate the methods, instruments used, and data gathered in non-experimental research, including surveys
- an ability to apply these concepts in students’ individual research projects
- ability to undertake appropriate item analysis as a part of scale development
- ability to interpret exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic techniques
- an ability to interpret output in a scientifically meaningful way
- ability to apply of validity and reliability concepts to practical applications of testing (e.g., fairness, credentialing standards)
- an understanding of the differences between classical test theory and item response theory
- an understanding of the limitations and shortcomings of psychometric/statistical models and statistical packages
- development of a critical and analytic approach towards measurement and psychometric theories

Lecture/tutorial outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Seminars</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Measurement: conceptual issues (II)</td>
<td>No tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research Methods: Non-experimental Research</td>
<td>Outline of the course. Outline of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scale development: Construct validation approach</td>
<td>Scale Development 1: Items biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EFA: Analysing Data and Interpretations</td>
<td>Scale Development 2: Data handling and Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EFA: Analysing Data and Interpretations (cont)</td>
<td>Scale Development 3: project (EFA &amp; Reliability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CFA: Analysing Data and Interpretations (cont)</td>
<td>CFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing 1</td>
<td>No tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing 2</td>
<td>Paper 1: Messick’s “Validity of psychological assessment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IRT 1</td>
<td>No tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IRT 2</td>
<td>Paper 2: Boorsboom et al.’s “The concept of validity”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

Two-hour examination in the Semester 1 exam period, part multiple choice, part short answer written questions.

Recommended readings and references will be provided.
3.2.2 ETHICS AND CURRENT AAND PROFESSIONAL ISSUES (semester 2, wks. 1-7)

Co-ordinator: Dr. Barbara Mullan  
Room: BM 446  
Phone: 9351 6811  
E-mail: barbara.mullan@sydney.edu.au

Other teaching staff: TBA

Format of Unit: 1 x 2 hour lecture per wk. x 7 wks.

Assessment: Examination (1.5 hours) on Monday, 21 September 2010 at 4.30pm  
(subject to change)

Unit of Study General Description

This unit covers current ethical and professional issues in Psychology: underlying principles & concepts. The relevance of ethics in research, clinical, health and other settings will be covered. The Professional Codes of Conduct published by both the New South Wales Psychologists Registration Board and Australian Psychological Society will be discussed. A variety of ethical issues will be covered. The empirical foundations for evidence-based treatments and personality and cognitive assessment will be addressed. Certain professional issues such as interviewing and communication skills will be addressed and the unit of study will provide opportunities for students to explore the importance of certain professional issues to professional practice.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the unit of study the student should be able to:

(i) Describe, explain, evaluate and apply principles of ethical conduct that apply to psychologists working in the areas of professional practice and research covered in the lecture series;
(ii) Consider the importance of the code of conduct in the major psychological areas;
(iii) Reflect on ethical dilemmas that are likely to be faced by practicing psychologists in a variety of areas;
(iv) Compare and contrast the communication skills needed in the different spheres of Psychology;
(v) Consider a variety of professional issues faced by practising psychologists.

Text

APS Code of Conduct for Psychologists:


For each topic a variety of reading will be provided and it is expected that students will initiate independent reading.

Lecture outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Hrs</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Professional Code of Conduct &amp; Ethics in Health Psychology</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Confidentiality &amp; Privacy; Boundary Violations; Sexual Misconduct</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research Ethics</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theoretical and empirical foundations for evidence based interventions</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality and Cognitive Assessment: Approaches &amp; Issues</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional issues</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara Mullan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 SPECIAL FIELDS SEMINAR ELECTIVES

All seminars will run during weeks 1-13 inclusive and will be of 1-2 hours duration.

Special Fields teaching objectives

These objectives apply to each of the Special Field areas, but specific areas may have additional objectives unique to that field.

(i) To develop in-depth knowledge of current developments in research and/or theory in the area covered by the Special Field seminars.

(ii) To take a critical stance in evaluating empirical evidence and/or psychological theories in the Special Field area.

(iii) To develop an appreciation of methodological issues in the Special Field area.

(iv) To develop an appreciation of ethical issues in the Special Field area.

(v) To be able to give an oral presentation of theoretical or empirical material relevant to the Special Field area.

General assessment guidelines for Special Fields seminars

The assessment for each Special Fields seminar will require the equivalent of approximately 4,000 words of written work. This total will be made up of various specific assessment tasks. Details of the assessment requirements for each Special Field seminar are given in section 3.3.2. However, all Special Fields seminars require the completion of a Major Assignment consisting of a substantial essay or critical review of at least 2,500 words. Topics for this major assignment will be available to download from webct by Friday, 19 March.

Each of the Special Fields major assignments must be written on distinctly different topics: there should be minimal or no overlap in the literatures and reference lists. Similarly, if the potential reference list for a student’s major assignment question were to overlap substantially with the references for the Empirical Thesis, then that topic is not appropriate as a major assignment for that student.

Note that if you do not take the Theoretical Thesis option, you MUST attend the weekly meetings for your two Special Fields seminars over the entire semester and contribute to the required seminar presentations or other nominated assessments. Students missing more than 20% of seminars during semester because of illness or misadventure must apply for special consideration through the School of Psychology.

3.3.1 SUBMISSION OF SPECIAL FIELDS MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS

The due date for Special Fields major assignments is no later than 4pm, Monday 14 June.

Although both major Special Fields assignments are due on the same day, you are strongly advised to set personal deadlines and pace your Special Fields seminar work, preparation and writing throughout the time available.

Two copies of each Special Fields major assignment must be submitted to the Psychology counter. Special Fields assignments do not need to be bound, but each copy must have the appropriate cover sheet, as well as a second page that contains only the title of the essay and an accurate word count (excluding abstract and references, but including in-text citations). To ensure anonymity during the examination process, the student’s name must not appear on the second cover sheet of the Special Field Assignment, nor anywhere else apart from the first cover sheet. Cover sheets will be sent to you by email.

Format: Each major essay must contain an abstract (maximum 200 words), and a reference list, and must not exceed the word length specified for that Special Field assignment (excluding abstract and references, but including in-text citations). The student will be penalised if they fail to provide an abstract and/or if the word length is exceeded by more than 5%. For further details regarding format and word limits, see Section 7.
3.3.2 SPECIAL FIELD SEMINARS

GROUP A

Current Approaches in Advanced Social Psychology
Convenors: Dr. Fiona White & Dr. Karen Gonsalkorale
Time: Monday, 12-2pm

These seminars aim to introduce students to current theories and methodologies of Advanced Social Psychology, promote analytical reasoning and effective communication skills. Following a detailed introduction by the convenors, the unit will primarily consist of student-led seminars. The first section will predominantly focus on issues relating to prejudice such as affirmative action, impression formation, social cognitive neuroscience, inter-group contact, family influences and developmental aspects. The second section will focus on issues related to social influence and the power of the situation such as determinants of attraction, violence in the media, and mood. Each student seminar presentation will be evaluated on the: (i) style of presentation, (ii) ability to critically evaluate research methods and theories, (iii) structure of presentation, and (iv) ability to stimulate discussion and answer questions.

Assessment:
Major (70%) A 2,500 word essay on a topic specified by the convenors
Minor (30%) A seminar presentation evaluated by the convenors

Current Issues In Developmental Psychology
Convenors: A/Prof. Pauline Howie & A/Prof. David Livesey
Time: Monday, 10am-12pm

This seminar will address current issues in human development, with particular emphasis on the ways in which different research methodologies are used to address different research questions. Where applicable, we will consider the implications of developmental research findings as a basis for social policy. Each student will present at least one seminar, in which they will be expected to outline the key issues in a recent research paper, and lead discussion on the paper. The areas covered will be determined by the interests of the participants, and could include a wide range of developmental areas across the entire life span.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on a topic to be specified by convenors
Minor (30%) Seminar presentation and contributions to discussion throughout semester

Learning: Current Issues
Convenors: A/Prof Justin Harris & Dr Evan Livesey
Time: Monday 4-6pm

The aims of this seminar are: to introduce and develop students’ understanding of selected issues in the study of human and animal learning; to develop students’ ability to evaluate a piece of research in terms of its theoretical and methodological contributions; and to develop students’ skills in presenting and discussing empirical research and theories in this area of psychology. Topics in both animal and human learning are likely to include some of the following: food preferences, social learning, perceptual learning, human causal judgements, implicit learning, conditioning models of drug tolerance.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay in which students are required to evaluate a recent research paper.
Minor (20%) Seminar presentation
(10%) Contributions to discussion throughout semester
Language and Decision Making  
Convenors: Professor Sally Andrews & Dr. Bruce Burns  
Time: Wednesday 2-4pm

This seminar series will focus on the cognitive processes involved in language processing and decision making. Language processing can be seen as a set of decisions about how the sensory input maps onto conceptual representations and how these concepts combine to determine the meaning of the spoken or written discourse. Theories of language processing therefore depend critically on assumptions about how knowledge is represented. Decision making also depends critically on how information is represented and much of that information is provided to us in the form of written or spoken language. Thus understanding how language is represented and processed contributes to understanding the processes and outcomes of decision making and to a range of applied issues. The particular topics to be discussed will be determined in consultation with students in the first class.

The seminars will be organised around research articles published on these topics. The initial seminars will be led by the lecturers who will discuss major theories and evidence in the domains of language and decision making and consider the relationships between them. In later classes, students will be responsible for leading discussions on papers related to language and decision making.

Assessment: 
Major (50%) 2,500 word essay on a question specified by convenors
Minor (40%) Depending on class numbers, 2-3 students will work as a team to lead the discussion of each topic and select relevant paper(s) to present to the class. Each student will be part of two pairs, for seminars on different topics. Assessment will be based on the presentation in class.
(10%) Students will be expected to read the articles for each week and to contribute to their discussion. Assessment will be based on the quality of each student’s contribution.

Neuroscience  
Convenor: Dr Ian Johnston and Professor Iain McGregor  
Time: Thursday 12-1pm

This seminar discusses recent important developments in the fields of behavioural neuroscience and psychopharmacology. The scope of the seminar is wide and involves consideration of studies involving both humans and laboratory animals. Each week, individual students or pairs of students do a presentation on a relevant topic. There is one “key paper” to read each week and every student is expected to read it – not just those presenting. The talk should not be all about the paper but should draw on the wider area of science surrounding it. Every Honours student attending the seminar must participate in at least one presentation.

Assessment: 
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay in which students are required to evaluate one of a number of recent research studies.
Minor (25%) Seminar presentation (including a one page written summary of presented topic  
(5%) Contributions to discussion throughout semester

Perception: From Unconscious Processing to Multi-modal Awareness  
Convenors: A/Prof. Colin Clifford and A/Prof. David Alais  
Time: Wednesday 1-2pm

The aims of this seminar are to develop critical understanding of current issues and developments in perception and sensory neuroscience, and to develop skills in critical evaluation of the scientific worth of research reports. The seminar will cover a broad range of topics, chosen from journal articles and book chapters, organized along two main themes: unconscious processing and multi-modal integration. The seminars on unconscious processing will address general issues on what it means for processing to be unconscious and how unconscious processing can be measured, as well as focussing on specific paradigms such as blind-sight and binocular rivalry. The seminars on multi-modal integration will include discussion of binding within and between modalities, the cross-modal construction of space, and the role of attention in sensory integration.
Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on a topic to be specified by convenors
Minor (20%) Seminar presentation (content and structure)
(10%) Contribution to discussion throughout the semester

Individual Differences
Convenors: Dr Carolyn MacCann & Dr Sabina Kleitman
Time: Tuesday 10-12pm

This seminar aims to introduce students to a wide variety of individual differences research, ranging from classic paradigms through to current research findings. Students should develop the ability to independently evaluate the methodology and conceptual basis underlying this area of research, and develop an appreciation of some of the applications of individual differences to personnel psychology and educational psychology. The course will focus on methodological issues (factor analysis and structural equation modelling) as well as substantive issues. Topics explored will include intelligence, personality, meta-cognition, and emotional intelligence. The format of the course will be a series of student-lead seminars based on key readings drawn from journal articles and book chapters. All students in the course will need to present a seminar based around one key paper. These presentations should involve more than a summary of the paper and include a critical evaluation of the paper with respect to other related research.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on a topic specified by convenors
Minor (30%) Seminar presentation (including 1-page summary handout)

Models & Theories: Their Role in the Scientific Process
Convenor: Dr. Fiona Hibberd
Time: Tuesday 4-5.30pm

NB: the satisfactory completion of HPSC 3023, or its equivalent, is NOT a pre-requisite for entry into this seminar.

Scientific progress requires a balance between three types of activity – empirical research, theory/model development and conceptual analysis. Yet Psychology is without this balance. Much of its activity is disproportionately stretched in the direction of empirical investigation. So, the aim of this special field is to examine the nature, function and heuristic value of certain models and theories across various areas of Psychology and to acquire some skills in developing and evaluating both.

Topics to be addressed include: representational and non-representational models; the value of a false model; the model as a mediating instrument; the roles of analogy and metaphor; how models relate to theories; how data relate to models and theories; the interplay between constructing and evaluating models and theories; criteria used to assess/test models and theories.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2500 word essay on a topic specified by the convenor.
Minor (30%) Each student will present and critically evaluate a theory/model central to their empirical research project.
GROUP B

Students are usually limited to participate in 1 of these seminars only

Eating Disorders
Conveners: Dr. Paul Rhodes & Prof. Stephen Touyz
Time: Friday 2-4pm

This course will encourage students to critically evaluate theoretical, methodological, and clinical issues relevant to the aetiology, diagnosis, and treatment of eating disorders. Set readings which address current themes or have been highly influential in the field of eating disorders will form the basis of each class. The classes will be structured as student-led seminars. Each student will be required to provide an oral presentation on one of the set-readings, to lead a class discussion on issues relevant to the paper, and to read the weekly set-readings in preparation for the class.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 essay on topic specified by convenors and related to a different topic than the seminar presentation.
Minor (30%) Each student will present a topic (20%) and will contribute to class discussions (10%).

Child Clinical Psychology
Convenors: A/Prof. Caroline Hunt & Dr. David Hawes
Time: Wednesday 11-1pm

This course will expose students to theoretical, methodological and clinical issues relevant to the aetiology, diagnosis and treatment of childhood psychological disorders. The classes will be structured as student-led seminars. The introductory classes will overview current theoretical and empirical approaches to the conceptualisation and measurement of childhood disorders. The remainder of the course will focus on new developments in understanding internalising and externalising disorders of childhood.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on topic specified by convenors.
Minor (30%) Presentation and class discussion

Health Psychology
Convenors: Prof. Phyllis Butow, Dr. Barbara Mullan & Dr. Ilona Juraskova
Time: Monday 2-4pm

The aim of this course is to advance students’ knowledge regarding the theoretical, methodological and clinical issues relevant to Health Psychology. The introductory class will orient the students to Health Psychology and the planned course. The remaining sessions will be student-led seminars focusing on: Advanced issues in survivorship; Advanced models of health behaviour; Managing pain; Carers’ burden and challenges; Alternative and complementary therapies; Informed consent to medical research; Sexual adjustment in chronic illness; Health interventions: making them work; HPV vaccination; Organ donation; and Designer babies. Throughout the course, we will discuss measurement and design issues in conducting research in this field. A range of illness and conditions will be used as case examples, including cancer, heart disease, rheumatoid arthritis and chronic pain.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 essay on topic specified by convenors (choice of three)
Minor (30%) Assessment of presentation to class.
Neuropsychological Rehabilitation
Convenors: Dr. Karen Croot & Dr. Sunny Lah
Time: Thursday 1-2pm

These seminars will introduce students to theory and practice in the rehabilitation of a range of cognitive impairments. Impairments discussed will include disorders of memory, language, attention, visual perception, executive function, and social and emotional functioning, following neurological insult. The seminars will survey how research into effective rehabilitation is formulated in each of these areas. We will consider the brain bases and cognitive bases for restoration of function during rehabilitation, and discuss whether it is more appropriate to seek to restore cognitive function or to develop compensatory strategies. Students will learn about the design of rehabilitation studies and consider the advantages and disadvantages of double-blind randomised control studies compared with single case methodologies. Students will be expected to read from the recommended text in preparation for weekly discussion and from the published scientific literature on neuropsychological rehabilitation to prepare for their major essay and for seminars. Students will also be in charge of leading one of the seminars on a topic of their choice within the areas covered. By the end of the seminar series, students will have a broad overview of current progress in rehabilitation across cognitive domains, as well as in-depth knowledge about two or three topics of their choice.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on a topic to be specified by convenors
Minor (20%) Seminar presentation. Please hand in two copies of power-point slides or overhead transparencies used in presentation (one for each convenor) before presentation.
(10%) Contributions to discussion throughout semester

Understanding and treating anxiety disorders
Convenors: Dr. Marianna Szabo & Dr. Maree Abbott
Time: Wednesday 2-3pm

This seminar will examine recent developments in the understanding and treatment of anxiety disorders. In this context the seminar will provide students with a more detailed understanding of two specific anxiety disorders. One section of the seminar will focus on Generalised Anxiety Disorder, and the other section on Social Phobia (Social Anxiety Disorder). Individual seminars will explore issues concerning the assessment, diagnosis, causation, maintenance and treatment of each of these two disorders. Developmental aspects of both Generalised Anxiety Disorder and Social Phobia will also be discussed. Students will be expected to present a seminar paper and lead a group discussion on their chosen topic.

Assessment:
Major (70%) 2,500 word essay on a topic to be specified by convenors
Minor (30%) Seminar presentation and contributions to discussions throughout the semester

3.4 SUPPLEMENTARY COURSEWORK

You are encouraged to attend the School of Psychology Research Colloquium

These are held on Fridays during semester time between 4 and 5pm in Education Lecture Room 424. Papers are presented dealing with current research in a range of areas in Psychology, some by researchers in other Australian and overseas universities, and some by members of our own staff. Presentations are followed by a question session. Attendance at the Colloquium will provide you with a valuable opportunity to hear psychologists – often internationally renowned – present their ideas and research. As well as expanding your awareness of research and providing you with insights into effective presentation techniques, attending these seminars will expose you to a range of ideas, which may be of direct help in your Honours work, and will allow you to make contact with people in the field. The Colloquium programme will be posted on the School’s web page.
4 THEORETICAL THESIS

4.1 NATURE OF THE THEORETICAL THESIS

Most commonly a Theoretical Thesis is concerned with some well-known theoretical concept that is influencing lines of research in an area of Psychology. The aim of the thesis should be to disentangle the theoretical presuppositions from the factual material that is supposed to support or exemplify them, and then to examine the theoretical component to see whether it is logically coherent, whether it can be expressed without necessarily leading to self-contradiction, whether it can be put to any conceivable empirical test, whether it can possibly increase our understanding of the phenomena under study or only give a spurious appearance of doing so, and so on. Most of the topics suggested in Section 4.4 below refer to theoretical concepts of that kind. Some other topics deal with aspects of theory-building as such; e.g. the nature of explanation, of confirmation and disconfirmation, the types and uses of theoretical constructs. These should always be worked out taking actual psychological theories as examples. A thesis which surveys some field of research and contends that the researcher has neglected to control for some empirical variable which may have been affecting the dependent variable, and so in effect suggests a new experiment, is not suitable for this part of the year's work. That kind of analysis and criticism would be relevant when working up the experimental design for the Empirical Thesis.

Generally, then, the Theoretical Thesis should be conceived as an exercise in purifying existing theories.

The thesis is assessed on the extent to which a student can carry out the sort of problem outlined above by the exercise of their own critical judgement. Students should guard against:

(i) adopting a particular theoretical position on some contentious issue without recognising that it is a subject of dispute;
(ii) accepting theory-loaded definitions as if they were statements of fact;
(iii) drawing conclusions which in fact simply do not follow from the material cited;
(iv) treating theories which contradict each other as if they were talking about different parts of the subject-matter, and so could peacefully co-exist;
(v) not being aware of relevant classic studies, where ‘classic’ means widely influential studies which established a new trend of thought;
(vi) taking one statement as definitive of an author’s position when it has been modified in a later work, as sometimes happens;
(vii) padding, irrelevancies, obscurities of language.

In the final assessment of the year’s work, the Theoretical Thesis can earn a good mark only if it has some real depth and substance. Serious intellectual work of this kind takes time. Students are advised to make their decision about a topic and begin their reading early in the year, thus allowing their ideas an adequate period of gestation.

Examiner’s report form

The report form, which each examiner completes as part of the examination of the final thesis (Appendix I), gives a clear indication of the assessment criteria used.

4.2 PREPARATION OF THE THEORETICAL THESIS

Dr. Hibberd (Rm 451 Brennan Building; phone 9351 2867; email fionah) is the co-ordinator of the Theoretical Thesis option. Please consult with her regarding a topic. You will be allocated a supervisor, after which changes of supervisor will be permitted only under exceptional circumstances, and must be approved by Dr. Hibberd. Changes of topic under the same supervisor are permissible if the supervisor is agreeable. Please inform Dr. Hibberd as soon as possible of any such changes.

Topic selection

A Theoretical Thesis may deal with any conceptual topic in Psychology, with the restriction that it may not be in the same specific area as that in which you are carrying out empirical research. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that students’ work is not too narrowly specialised. Topics in the same general area of Psychology (e.g., Learning, Social, Neuroscience) are not specifically excluded, but permission must be obtained from Dr. Hibberd. Permission will only be granted where it is clear that the student will be undertaking work in substantially different topic areas and there is minimal or no overlap in the literatures.
Frequency of supervision consultation

The supervisor should be consulted at least once a fortnight with more frequent consultations likely in the early stages and toward the end. In general, the frequency of consultation is a matter for the supervisor and the student to determine, but it is the student’s responsibility to ensure that s/he makes proper use of the supervision facilities and informs Dr. Hibberd if problems arise.

Supervisor’s report

After the thesis submission date, as part of the thesis examination process, your supervisor will be asked to provide a report of your work, including ratings of the amount of consultation, the extent of the supervisor’s involvement in choice and definition of the topic, the extent of editorial assistance, the extent to which Draft(s) were read, the extent of any outside help, and any special circumstances which may be relevant (See a copy of the supervisor’s report form in Appendix H). The supervisor’s report will, however, not affect the examiner’s final assessment unless any of these aspects fall outside the normal range.

4.3 WRITING THE THEORETICAL THESIS

Submission of Draft

The Theoretical Thesis draft must be submitted directly to your thesis supervisor no later than Monday, 5 July, 2010. Supervisors will provide comments on drafts submitted by this date only if they are written in consecutive prose style, i.e., drafts should not be in note form.

Submission of Final Theoretical Thesis

The due date for submission of the Theoretical Thesis is no later than 4pm on Monday, 26 July, 2010. Note: Please refer to Section 7 for detailed instructions on how to submit the final copies of your Theoretical Thesis.

Word limit

The Theoretical Thesis MUST NOT EXCEED 8,000 WORDS IN LENGTH (including in-text citations, but excluding abstract, tables, captions, references and appendices). Where the word length is exceeded by more than 5%, the student will be penalised. There is no penalty for word counts which are less than 8,000 words.

4.4 POSSIBLE THEORETICAL THESIS TOPICS

You are advised to consult recent issues (say 2006-2010) of the journals below. This will give you a sense of current theoretical research in Psychology.

American Journal of Psychoanalysis
American Journal of Psychology
American Psychologist
Behavior and Philosophy
History of the Human Sciences
History of Psychology
International Journal of Psychoanalysis
Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour
Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences
Journal of Mind & Behavior
Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology
Mind
Mind & Language
New Ideas in Psychology
Philosophy of the Social Sciences
Philosophy, Psychiatry & Psychology
Philosophical Psychology
Psychological Science
Psychologist
Social Studies of Science
Theory and Psychology

Other possible topics are listed below. If you wish to write on a subject not listed below, then you’re free to specify your own topic in consultation with Dr. Hibberd, bearing in mind the restriction that your Theoretical Thesis may not be in the same specific area as that of your empirical research.
Note: some topics could be classed under more than one of the headings below.

**Abnormal Psychology**
1. Multiple personality and personal identity
2. The “rationality” of depression
3. Conceptual issues in defining personality disorders
4. Conceptual issues in psychiatric classification
5. The “scientist/practitioner model” in clinical psychology.
6. What is "health psychology"?

**Cognitive Processes**
1. The concept of error
2. The concept of "information"
3. The metaphorical status of “information-processing”
4. The distinction between implicit and explicit memory
5. The concept of meta-cognition

**Conceptual Foundations of Quantitative Methods**
1. The concept of measurement
2. Operationalism in psychology: Empiricism or rationalism?
3. The quantitative/qualitative distinction in psychology

**Developmental Psychology**
1. Piaget’s "constructivist" approach to language acquisition
2. Innatism vs constructivism: A barren confrontation?
3. The concept of a language acquisition device
4. Piaget’s concept of egocentrism
5. The concept of “attachment”
6. The development of the concept of an object

**Individual Differences and Personality**
1. The concept of 'intelligence' in contemporary psychology
2. Ability, capacity, potential and the like - unnecessary constructs?
3. The contribution of factor analysis to the study of individual differences in abilities or personality
4. Heredity vs environment in intelligence - an irresolvable issue?
5. The concept of 'task-difficulty'
6. The status of the notion of sexual difference in psychological theorising
7. The concept of personality "trait" in contemporary and recent psychology
8. The concept of mental energy in psychoanalytic theory
9. Biological bases of intelligence - reductionism in its crudest form?

**Learning**
1. The claim that animals acquire propositional knowledge
2. The claim that all forms of learning are associative in nature
3. The concept of awareness as a correlate of learning
4. The distinction between explicit and implicit learning
5. Memory in non-human animals

**Motivation / Human Performance**
1. Emotion as a motivational concept in contemporary and recent psychology
2. The distinction between energy and direction in behaviour
3. The concept of mental effort
4. The value of the concept of "arousal" to psychology
5. Relating electrophysiological recordings to psychological phenomena

**Perception**
1. The concept of perceptual structure
2. In what sense can psychological and neuro-physiological experiments provide an explanation of perceptual events?
3. Parallel Distributed Processing network models: Do they provide explanations of behaviour?
4. Do neural networks explain perception or behaviour?
5. The logical status of emergent properties in perception and/or cognition
6. The logical status of Gibson's concept of "affordance"
Physiological Psychology
   (i) Is there any difference between reward and reinforcement?
   (ii) The concept of emergence.

Psycholinguistics
   (i) Thought and language
   (ii) The concept of a "mental lexicon"

Social Psychology
   (i) The logic of socio-biological explanations
   (ii) What is Evolutionary Psychology?
   (iii) The concept of attitude
   (iv) Is Western social psychology really social?

Theory and Systems
   (i) The value of 'model-building' in psychology
   (ii) Phenomenology vs direct realism
   (iii) The explanatory power of social constructionism
   (iv) The logical status of "representations" in psychological theory
   (v) The contribution of psychological research to theories in the philosophy of science
   (vi) In what sense (if any) is behaviour creative?
   (vii) The social construction of 'psychological' phenomena
   (viii) The motivational component of error
   (ix) The relationship between psychoanalysis and neuroscience
5 EMPIRICAL THESIS

5.1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF PROJECT

Students conduct a research project under the supervision of a staff member and report this project in a thesis of between 9,000 and 12,000 words (main text only: excluding abstract, tables, captions, references, and appendices, but including in-text citations). Students are evaluated on their ability to:

(i) identify a research problem to be investigated;
(ii) demonstrate understanding of relevant background literature and appreciation of theoretical and methodological issues;
(iii) design a study that takes account of these issues and has the potential to answer the question(s) posed;
(iv) conduct an investigation with due regard to adequate procedure and controls;
(v) appropriately analyse the data;
(vi) correctly interpret the data, taking account of any inadequacies and ambiguities, and adequately relate the findings to the issues raised in the literature review, and
(vii) report the results of the research project concisely and clearly using the publication conventions of the American Psychological Association.

The criteria listed above are reflected in the Examiner’s Report form that each examiner completes as part of the assessment of the final thesis (Appendix G).

5.2 SUPERVISION OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

Allocation of supervisors

Supervision of empirical research projects is usually carried out individually. On very rare occasions, students may work in pairs or collaborate with other students on aspects of a research project. In such cases, students are still required to develop and investigate individual research questions. Once allocated to a supervisor, the student and supervisor discuss and refine the topic and decide on the most appropriate supervision arrangements.

Note that while students entering Honours are asked to submit their empirical research area preferences, and may even indicate a preferred supervisor, it is never possible to accommodate all requests. A variety of factors constrain the allocation of supervisors and research areas although the School makes every effort to satisfy as many student preferences as possible.

Independence and originality of research

It is a requirement that students investigate and report on independent research questions. The Australian Psychological Society guidelines for fourth year programs specify that each student must “participate in all of the steps involved in research including formulation of research questions, the design of the study including selection of appropriate methodology, the collection and analysis of data to test the research question, the interpretation of findings and the writing up of the report”. Each student’s research question must be independent in the sense that it is neither a direct replication of an existing study, nor a project already designed by the supervisor. The supervisor may, however, point students in a particular direction or suggest a broad issue that needs investigation.

These independence requirements do not prevent students working on related projects and sharing aspects of the work involved in data collection. For example, students might use different aspects of the data they have obtained from a single survey or questionnaire, or investigate the effect of different variables on a phenomenon under study, or conduct different experiments on the same or closely related topic (possibly even using the same apparatus, techniques, participants). However, each student would still select a specific research question for their project and would develop an appropriate design and methodology to investigate it. Such cases might involve joint supervision sessions because of the overlapping areas of relevance in the two projects, but the projects have to remain distinct and separable. Students working within such arrangements may collaborate in the collection of data where appropriate (e.g., large surveys), but their empirical reports would have to treat different subsets of data, and be written up completely independently. Note that any deviation from these requirements would be immediately obvious during assessment since the same examiner would normally mark both theses under such circumstances.
Identifying a research question

In consultation with your supervisor, you will read carefully in your topic area and identify a research question that is broadly within your supervisor's interests and expertise. In discussion with your supervisor, you must refine the topic into one that can be practically addressed within the available time. You should not expect your supervisor to answer the question "What should I do?". Rather, you should develop specific questions and possible hypotheses, designs, procedures, etc., for your supervisor to comment on. The reading process is about acquiring important background knowledge in your area and narrowing the scope of your project's central question to something manageable within the brief period available.

Although the emphasis is on your generating your own research ideas and methodologies, most students will not do this entirely independently. You are an apprentice in the research process and your supervisors have the expertise to guide you and experience of the practical constraints that limit the scope of fourth year research projects. Thus, while supervisors expect students to generate their own ideas about possible research projects, students have the right to guidance from supervisors and advice regarding potential conceptual, methodological or analytical shortcomings.

Supervisory sessions

Meetings with the supervisor normally occur weekly, especially early in the year, and may last up to 1 hour, preferably at the same time each week. Students who are working on related topics will normally meet the supervisor at the same time. During certain periods of the year, meetings may be more frequent while at other times, for example during testing, they may be less so, but the average frequency will tend to be once a week. Both students and supervisors have the responsibility of organising and attending regular supervision meetings and of notifying the Honours Empirical Thesis co-ordinator of any problems that are impeding the supervision process.

Reading the Draft thesis

Supervisors have a responsibility to read and provide detailed feedback on one Draft of the Introduction, Method and Results sections of your thesis. Supervisors may be willing to provide more limited feedback on a revision of these sections. Supervisors are not permitted to read or provide comments on the written version of your Discussion, although you can discuss the ideas for your Discussion with your supervisor. The Discussion is a crucial section where students can show their ability to interpret data and theorise about their findings. Keeping it free of the supervisor's direct input provides an opportunity for examiners to evaluate your ability independently of the supervisor's influence.

Note that research staff or students within the School (e.g., your supervisor's PhD students or post-doctoral researchers) are also not permitted to provide commentary on Discussion sections. Breaches of this rule will be penalised.

Supervisor's report (see Appendix F)

After the thesis submission date, as part of the examination process, the supervisor will report on the independence of each student's contribution to the various components of the research process. The report covers the extent of the supervisor's involvement in choice of topic and experimental design, the amount of consultation, the extent of statistical assistance, amount of editing assistance on Drafts, and the extent of any outside help. The report is an important part of the assessment process as it takes account of differences between students in the degree of help received. Remember, though, that all students need advice from their supervisor at various times so you should not over-emphasise the importance of demonstrating independence. Your final mark will not be adversely affected unless the level of assistance was outside the normal range. Conversely, very high ratings for independence will not guarantee you a high mark if your failure to seek advice resulted in major flaws in your research.
5.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Once you and your supervisor have finalised your research topic and experimental design, you are required to prepare a 1,250 word Research Proposal that includes:

- a brief summary of the relevant background literature
- a clear statement of the research hypotheses to be tested
- a research design and the methods and procedures to be used
- outline of how the data will be analysed
- a completed copy of the Ethics Declaration (see section 5.4 and Appendix B)

It is recommended that your proposal consider different potential outcomes. What results will you find if your hypothesis is confirmed? Which alternative outcomes may arise? Carefully considering hypothetical outcomes and their implications helps you think clearly about your hypotheses and whether your planned experiments really do address them. You may include hypothetical data plots to summarise your predictions.

Your supervisor will read a Draft of your proposal and provide you with feedback on content and clarity. Discussion of the proposal with your supervisor may reveal unforeseen problems and scope for further improvement.

The final version of your Research Proposal and Ethics Declaration (Appendix B) must be submitted to the Psychology Administration Office by Friday April 16th. The Ethics Declaration needs to be submitted electronically (see Appendix B). You may submit the proposal earlier, from Friday April 2nd. A School staff member (not your supervisor) from your general research domain will read your proposal and provide feedback, commenting on the clarity of the research question and hypotheses, appropriateness of the design and methods, and proposed statistical analyses, and any potential issues that the student and supervisor should consider. The reviewer will also confirm that the project is compatible with ethics guidelines. A Research Proposal Review (Appendix D) will be returned to the student and supervisor as quickly as possible. An early submission might expedite this feedback.

The Research Proposal is not assessable. Its main purpose is to provide you with independent input from another expert who may be able to observe shortcomings and/or suggest improvements. Very often there is no single “right answer” regarding design and methodology, so the review will not necessarily “approve” or “disapprove” of the project but may instead offer alternative approaches. The review also gives students a preliminary experience of the peer review processes that they are likely to encounter in their professional lives as psychologists.

5.4 ETHICS REQUIREMENTS AND SUBJECT RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES

5.4.1 APPLYING FOR ETHICS APPROVAL

All research conducted at the University of Sydney requires formal approval from the University’s Ethics Office. Applications for approval are made either to the Animal Ethics Committee or to the Human Research Ethics Committee. Students should consult with their supervisor to determine what action is needed with regard to ethics approval. Information about the ethics approval processes is available from the Ethics Office:

http://sydney.edu.au/ethics

There are two cases where ethical approval for your project might already exist:

Case 1) In many cases, research projects by Honours students using Psychology 1 students as participants are covered by a general approval issued to the School of Psychology by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. This approval covers many standard psychological procedures, but is limited to those specifically outlined in the School’s application, as listed in Appendix A. The full application can be found on the School’s Honours web page:


Case 2) In some cases, a student’s research project may be closely related to the supervisor’s ongoing research activity for which ethical approval will already have been given. In such cases the supervisor can fill out a “modification” form and request that the student’s name be added to the list of researchers approved to work on that project (the form is available for download from the Ethics Office web page: see link above). Discuss with your supervisor whether your proposed project falls into this category.
Case 1: Research covered by group application for research with Psychology 1 students

If your research falls into this category, indicate it in the Ethics Declaration Form (Appendix B). This form is submitted electronically and will be forwarded to the subject pool coordinator. In addition, you must submit the following to the subject pool coordinator, Dr Caleb Owens (caleb.owens@sydney.edu.au), when you set up your experiment in SONA:

1. A copy of Experiment Description that will go on the SONA program to recruit participants for the study.
2. A copy of the Subject Debrief.

Case 2: Research covered by supervisor’s ethics approval

If your research is covered under your supervisor’s approval, your supervisor will submit a ‘modification’ request to the Ethics Office adding your name as a student investigator on the project. Once permission is granted, you will need to submit a copy of the Ethics approval letter to the Psychology Administration Office. If your study involves Psych 1 student participants, also email this letter to the subject pool coordinator, Dr Caleb Owens (you won’t be given approval to use SONA until this happens); make sure you also forward Dr Owens the additional material at points 1-2 in Case 1. Otherwise, once you have Ethics permission, you may begin testing.

Research not covered by case 1 or case 2: Individual submissions to the University Ethics Committee

If your research is not covered by case 1 or case 2, you will need to submit an individual ethics application to the relevant University Ethics Committee. The following research falls into this category:

1) Any research activity using Psychology 1 students that employ procedures not covered in the School’s general approval (see Appendix A).
2) All human research that involves participants other than Psychology 1 students.
3) All animal research projects.

Be warned that the process for separate ethics approval can be long and time-consuming so plan your ethics submission early. You cannot start your experiments until approval is granted. Application forms are available at the following web pages:

Research involving humans:

Research involving animals:

Individual applications must be read and signed first by your supervisor, and second by a Psychology ethics advisor (see below) before submission to the relevant University Ethics Committee. Ethics committee meetings occur fortnightly and submission deadlines are strictly enforced, so make an appointment with the relevant School advisor at least 7 days prior to the Ethics submission deadline. The dates of Ethics Committee meetings and deadlines for submissions are available here:


Ethics advisors in the School of Psychology

Human Ethics Advisors:

Dr. Sunny Lah
McCallum 422, phone 9351 2648. Email: suncica.lab@sydney.edu.au

Dr. Paul Rhodes
Clinical Psychology Unit, Transient Building 158, phone 9351 6708. Email: paul.rhodes@sydney.edu.au
Animal Ethics Advisor:

Dr. Ian Johnston
Brennan 454, phone 9351 4353. Email: i.johnston@sydney.edu.au

Obtaining participants from outside the School of Psychology

Where a research project requires the use of participants outside the School of Psychology, supervisors should monitor student experimenters as closely as they would normally. They will also ensure that formal arrangements are in place if an organization outside the School is involved (e.g., a school, clinic, office, theatre, etc).

Even though a project may be conducted entirely outside the University, the University Human Research Ethics Committee must still approve the project. The Supervisor and the School’s ethics advisor will guide the student. The ethics advisor should review and sign the application before submission no later than 5pm Thursday before the closing date. The University Ethics Committee usually takes three to four weeks to approve submissions, but can take longer if modifications are required.

NOTE: some external organizations will require a separate ethics application to be submitted, in addition to the University’s application. Additional time should be allowed for this process.

Use of school children as participants

Applications to conduct research in schools need to be made to the State Office of the Department of School Education, through the State Education Research Approval Process (SERAP). Proposals must have the approval of the University Ethics Committee before final approval can be granted by the Department of School Education. You will need to make a case that your research will “add to the store of knowledge and understanding”, will not adversely affect students, and will involve an “acceptable level of disruption to the teaching and learning programs of the schools”. Approval must also be obtained from the principals of participating schools. SERAP applications can be made online at the Department of Education and Training’s web site: https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/serap/

Applications to the Department of School Education should be submitted at least six weeks before the time at which the research is to commence, as proposals may need to be revised and re-submitted.

The Guidelines for Approving Applications from External Agencies to Conduct Research in NSW Government Schools, incorporating further details and application forms, can be accessed at the following URL:


Requests to use school children in the Catholic school system may need to be made formally to the Catholic Education Office for the relevant diocese. Enquiries should be made in the first instance to the school principals. The use of non-Catholic independent school children has usually been by personal arrangement by the Honours student with the school.

Note that the new guidelines require all researchers who will be testing children to complete a Prohibited Employment form (“Form B”) which declares that: (a) they are aware of the special responsibilities associated with undertaking research with children, particularly in relation to child protection; (b) they do not have a criminal record, and (c) that there are no other circumstances which might preclude their undertaking research with children and young people. This form should be submitted to Ms Sandra Cheng, Manager of Finance and Administration, School of Psychology. Schools may also require a copy of this form. The form is available from the Ethics Office or DET.

5.4.2 COURSE ON ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

Students undertaking research using animals and animal tissue are required to attend a course on Animal Experimentation before they initiate their research. Make sure that you discuss this requirement with your supervisor if you are conducting research with animals. Laboratory Animal Services will be running its next ‘Introduction to Animal Research’ course on February 22nd and 23rd 2010 (note the split dates). The course focuses on the ethical and legal aspects of animal use in research and teaching. Program details and a registration form are now available for downloading from the Ethics Office website: http://sydney.edu.au/ethics/animal/education_and_training. To register, please email a completed form to the
5.4.3 RECRUITING PARTICIPANTS FROM PSYCHOLOGY 1

General ethical considerations for research using Psychology 1 students (see Appendix B)

Psychology 1 students are encouraged to participate in research being conducted by School staff and students. Experimenters must follow the agreed procedures laid down by the University’s Human Ethics Committee. Carefully read the Research Participation information provided to Psychology 1 students so that you are familiar with the procedures. Particularly note the following important issues:

**Clear description:** information provided to students about the experiment should make it clear - from the title and a brief description - what the study will entail for participants. It must not be misleading. A Subject Information Sheet must be provided when requesting participants. In some cases there are good reasons why the description cannot reveal the main aim of the study, although this should be explained in debriefing information.

**Debriefing:** all participants should be informed about the aims and design of any study in which they participate. Although many students will be content with a brief description, opportunity should always be provided for further discussion with those who are interested. Research participation provides Psychology 1 students with direct experience of psychological research and they receive a small amount of course credit for participating. It is important that researchers take care to make this opportunity educational for them.

**Strict confidentiality:** extreme care should be taken to ensure that all personal information, including phone numbers, and any means of identifying individual participants, is confidential to the researcher only. Any record of such information should be destroyed as soon as the study is completed.

**Right to withdraw at any time:** it should be made clear to students that they have the right to withdraw, without consequence, from a study at any time, particularly if it involves stress or personal data. Researchers should not exert any pressure on students to remain in an experiment if they indicate they wish to leave.

Procedures for recruiting Psychology 1 participants (see Appendix C)

The research participation of Psychology 1 students is managed on-line using a system called SONA. Training in the use of this system will be provided in the Honours software information session.

Each researcher is permitted to use no more than 120 hours per year (60 hours per semester) from the Psychology 1 subject pool. Towards the end of semester, if demand exceeds supply, these constraints will be relaxed.

5.5 CONSULTATIONS FOR RESEARCH DESIGN AND STATISTICS

The School’s statistical advisers are:

- **Semester 1:** Dr. Margaret Charles (Room 452 Brennan McCallum, phone 9351 3354, email: margaret.charles@sydney.edu.au)
- **Semesters 1 and 2:** Dr. Niko Tiliopoulos (Room 448 Brennan McCallum, 9036 9223; email: niko.tiliopoulos@sydney.edu.au)

To ensure that these staff are not overburdened, Honours students and staff are asked to observe the following procedures:

(i) Your supervisor should be your initial and primary source of consultation on matters of designing an empirical study and possibilities for statistical analyses.

(ii) If necessary, the school’s statistical advisors should be consulted on more technical matters of design and analysis or where student and supervisor may disagree on the appropriate statistical analysis. If you or your supervisor decide that such a consultation is needed, the supervisor should arrange for a meeting and would normally attend with the student.
5.6 WRITING THE EMPIRICAL THESIS

Submission of thesis Drafts

Arrange with your supervisor a timetable for writing Drafts of the various thesis sections so that you pace yourself appropriately and receive feedback on the non-Discussion sections in time to incorporate it into your final submission. Some supervisors prefer to read a complete Draft of the Introduction, Method and Results while others prefer to read each section separately as you complete it. Regardless, it is important to work out a writing schedule and keep to it (see Empirical Project Timeline in Section 2.5). Thesis Drafts should be in legible form, written in consecutive prose style, not note form. Supervisors may, legitimately, refuse to read Drafts that do not satisfy these criteria.

To monitor your writing progress and to identify any factors that have impeded your progress, you are required to submit an Empirical Progress Report (Appendix E) to the Administration Office by Wednesday 29th September. This provides you with the opportunity to inform the Honours co-ordinator of any factors that have impeded the progress of your research project. These factors must be noted if they are to provide the basis for Special Consideration or for an extension request. The report must be signed by your supervisor.

5.7 FORMAT OF THE EMPIRICAL THESIS

The body of the Empirical Thesis should contain:

(i) an abstract (a single paragraph with a maximum of 300 words);
(ii) a clear statement of the study’s aim and a critical review of the relevant literature, providing a rationale for the study to be conducted;
(iii) a statement of the dependent and independent variables, and the hypotheses being tested;
(iv) descriptions of participants, stimulus materials, apparatus, procedure, instructions and method of data collection;
(v) a description and justification of statistical methods, demonstrating an understanding of the scientific appropriateness of those methods;
(vi) an appropriate summary of descriptive results, with tables and/or graphs;
(vii) an appropriate summary of the statistical analyses;
(viii) a discussion of your findings in relation to the problem addressed and the findings of others;
(ix) a discussion of your project’s shortcomings and the implications/suggestions for future research;
(x) a high level of presentation, as well as clarity and conciseness of exposition;
(xi) evidence of originality and an indication of ability to conduct and report research work.

It is a good idea to follow the format of the major journals in your area of research when structuring various sections of your thesis. This will ensure that the sections are appropriately laid out and will reduce the likelihood of changes being suggested by your supervisor.

Appendices

Appendices should be comprehensive and include all back-up documentation, including:

(i) ethics approval, subject information sheets and consent forms (taking care to remove references to your name, in the interests of anonymity during the marking process);
(ii) questionnaires, tests and other materials;
(iii) full details of instructions, equipment used etc.;
(iv) details of statistical analyses not included in the main body of the thesis. Be intelligently selective in the statistical output you select from statistical packages. You should make clear in the body of your thesis what has been done; relevant but incidental detail should be placed in an appendix;
(v) raw data in disc form (see guidelines below).

There is no specific word limit for appendices, and they are not included in the thesis word count. However, note that an appendix is not an appropriate way of adding extra text to your thesis. Examiners are not impressed by the sheer bulk of an appendix and your appendix will not be examined as part of your thesis, but rather used by the examiner to clarify aspects of your procedures or analysis. Note that it is unlikely that both of your markers will be specialists in your research area: be sure to include sufficient details of experimental procedure so that a psychologist who is not a specialist in your specialised area can understand what you have done. If you have a large number of appendices, a contents page at the beginning of the appendices section is strongly advised.
Guidelines for submitting raw data

You must include the raw data from your experiments in your thesis, attached inside the back cover on a CD. The “raw data” are the data you used for your analyses. For example, if your research required you to assess a given subject several times to calculate a stable average response for your analysis, your raw data in such a case would be the mean response measures (for each subject and condition). Alternatively, you may have created a difference score between two variables on which you did your analysis. Then you should include the difference score as a variable along with the original variables from which the difference scores were derived. In short, the data you analysed are the raw data and they must be submitted on a CD. Three CDs are required - one for each copy of the thesis.

Ensure that anyone who opens the file will be readily able to access and analyse your data. The data must be in either an Excel file or an SPSS file (portable format). SPSS files can be transformed into Excel files by selecting the appropriate option in the program’s ‘Save’ menu.

Identifying the variables in your raw data

You need to include an appendix within the printed thesis describing the nature and structure of the raw data file. That is: (a) identify all the variables and the order in which they appear (b) if necessary, make clear what each variable name signifies, and (c) indicate the coding used for each variable (e.g., “Variable ‘gender’: biological sex of each participant: 1= male; 2=female”).

Journal format

Aim for publication. Think of your research project as something that could be submitted for publication, given necessary changes and edits following the examination process. The headings you use should follow those recommended in the American Psychological Association Guidelines for Publication, i.e., sections, rather than chapters.

Your empirical thesis, however, will deviate from typical journal articles in several ways. The Introduction will usually be longer, as you demonstrate your scholarship through a thorough literature review, followed by clear statements of rationale, research questions, and specific hypotheses. Other sections are also likely to be longer than the typical journal paper (including statistics and methods). In journal papers, there is a less stringent requirement to demonstrate in detail the author’s understanding of the concepts underlying the research reported. In a thesis, you need to give clear evidence that you understand the scientific appropriateness of the analyses you are performing. Therefore, use journal articles as models only, but be aware that more detail is required in a thesis.

Remember, too, that the word limit is not a goal. The 12,000-word limit is an absolute upper limit, and the quality of an empirical thesis does not depend on its length. Concise reporting is part of the marking criteria, and is a hallmark of all good theses. The Australian Psychological Society’s minimum length requirement is 9,000 words of main text.

5.8 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ISSUES

The work you complete under the supervision of a staff member is your intellectual property. The University of Sydney recognises that students own any intellectual property that they create unless there is a law that says otherwise or the student agrees otherwise. Also, the Copyright Amendment (Moral Rights) Act (2000) recognises the right of authors to be identified as the author of a work, to take action against false attribution of authorship, and to object to derogatory treatment of his/her work that prejudicially affects his/her honour or reputation. It is important to clarify with your supervisor issues of authorship if you are planning to publish any of your Honours work. If you plan to publish your Honours work as a self-contained article, or if it will form part of a larger publication with your supervisor or other collaborators, be sure to discuss the issue of authorship and the order of authors, if there’s to be more than one.
6 SCHOOL FACILITIES, RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Full details of these facilities and services are available from the School of Psychology web (http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/dept_documents/resources/). This contains important information about how to access services, and about regulations governing their use. A summary of the issues of particular relevance to Honours students is provided below. The contact person for matters concerned with the technical and computing resources of the School is Dr. Barbara Mullan (Room 446 Brennan MacCallum, ph. 9351 6811, email barbara.mullan).

6.1 ACCESS TO SPACE AND BUILDINGS

Research Laboratories

Students requiring laboratory space for projects should approach their supervisor who may be able to arrange laboratory facilities. The use of all School research laboratory space is supervised by A/Prof. Justin Harris (Room 478 Griffith Taylor, ph. 9351 2864, email justin.harris). Requests for research laboratory space must be directed to A/Prof. Harris who should be informed of the commencing and anticipated final dates for usage.

Keys and access to School facilities

Honours students may only be issued with a key to the laboratory in which they are conducting their project. Julia Ning (GT 492; phone 9351 2865, email julia.ning) is responsible for issuing keys. If you need a key you should take a supporting letter from your supervisor to Julia, along with a completed key request form available on the web (http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/Local/Forms/). Please note that it may take up to 4 days to arrange the issue of a key.

After-hours access to the Griffith Taylor Building can be obtained from the Security Office, Services Building. Staff are NOT permitted to lend keys to students.

6.2 TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Technical assistance

There are many students in Psychology Honours and the School’s technical staff have a heavy workload. The School has licenses for many experimental and statistical computer applications and most supervisors have apparatus appropriate for their research area. In general, Honours students should use these existing programs and apparatus to conduct their research. Because minor modifications may be necessary for a particular project, Honours students are entitled to a maximum of 6 hours technical support time. This includes time for modifying programs, setting up laboratories, editing videotapes, consulting about statistics packages etc. The computing and technical staffs have been instructed not to write new programs for Honours students but they will modify existing programs, within the 6 hour time limit. If there are truly exceptional circumstances, this time limit will be extended, but a case for such extension would have to be made in writing with a supporting statement from the supervisor to Dr. Barbara Mullan. Requests for assistance from technical support staff must be submitted by supervisors through the online Technical Services Request System.

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/Local/ttechRequest/

Students may not directly contact the support staff except for urgent matters (such as printer paper jams).

Fourth year maintenance allowance

Each Honours student is entitled to a maximum of $100 of School funds to support the costs of research material or thesis production. Application for this allowance must be made on forms available from the Head of School Administrative Assistant, Ms. Julia Ning (GT 492; 9351 2865; email julia.ning), and signed by the supervisor. Receipts must be provided. Because of the limited School resources, Psychology students are not permitted to use the School’s photocopiers. Students can present receipts for the costs of photocopying in other locations for reimbursement from their $100 allowance. To expedite payment, claims should be made as early as possible, and no later than the end of October.
6.3 COMPUTING RESOURCES

School of Psychology Home Page


Information for Honours students will be displayed on the web, WebCT or sent to students via email. It is in your own interests to log on regularly and check the web and your email to ensure you have not missed an announcement.

Computer Room

Non-teaching computer room: Room 200 Griffith Taylor is a non-teaching computer room available for the use of Honours students for word processing, data entry and analysis etc. This room is not to be used for testing or teaching purposes. Macintosh and PC computers are available, with Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint) and SPSS, through your UniKey account.

Resources on PCs and Macintosh Computers

The personal computers throughout the School offer word processing (Microsoft Word), spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel), presentation (Microsoft Powerpoint), statistical analysis (SPSS), web access (IE, FireFox, Safari) and e-mail software. In addition, there is software for data collection and experimental control to which the student may be directed by the supervisor as they are needed. Further information about these resources will be provided in the computing information session on February 25, 2010.

Data collection and experimental control software:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquisit</td>
<td>Inquisit is a psychological experiment generator that allows the researcher to create custom questionnaires, reaction time tasks, signal detection tests, attitude measures, and experiments in cognition and perception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LimeSurvey</td>
<td>LimeSurvey is an open source questionnaires software that allows easy construction of on-line questionnaires for staff or research students who wish to run questionnaires in an electronic format through the Internet. The program is highly flexible, allowing a range of types of answer styles (multiple-choice, Lickert scale, short-answer, etc.) and more complex elements such as graphics and conditional branching. Once constructed, the questionnaires are run from the School’s server and results can be downloaded through a web browser. LimeSurvey tutorial session will be offered in late March 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge of software

Knowing how to operate standard software, such as Microsoft Word, Excel and SPSS, is assumed, and you will need these skills for your data analysis and written work. You are encouraged to obtain manuals from the University Information Services and to use the on-line help accompanying the software. Your supervisor is the primary source for help about relevant software and fellow students will be another excellent resource. Some expert help may be available from Dr. Margaret Charles or Dr. Niko Tiliopoulos (see table below for contact details). For more specialised software, assistance may be available from the computer support staff.

Back-ups

It is important not to leave your files on the School’s computers: all such files on hard disks on these computers are deleted each night. Always keep good backups of your files in at least two places. Form a habit of copying your file from your memory stick onto the hard disk of the computer you are working on, and work on only the hard disk copy. After you finish working on the file, copy it back to two separate places under a new name, so that you do not overwrite the older version. Then, delete the file from the hard disk.

Graphics Laboratory

Room 472 Griffith Taylor contains the School’s graphics suite, with scanner and colour printing. Students must book a time with the computer staff to use this facility.
Colour printing

The school’s graphics lab has an A3 Epson stylus colour ink-jet printer and an A4 colour laser printer. Colour printing is, however, very expensive. Please consult with your supervisor as to the necessity of colour printing if you wish to use this facility for your research. The cost must be negotiated with the computing staff beforehand.

Teaching computer labs

The facilities in the School’s teaching computer laboratories may be used for data collection or general use when not required for teaching. You must book the teaching computer labs in advance at the Psychology Administration Office (BM 325).

Laser-printing facilities

Honours students may use the School’s laser printing facilities. Each student’s usage is automatically recorded against his/her account. The cost of laser-writer output is 10 cents per page, and students may use their $100 allowance to meet this charge. Printing costs which exceed this allowance will be charged to the student. It should be noted that the School’s system does not support all the type fonts available on Macintosh computers, and students should verify that the type font they wish to use is available. Students preparing material at home and intending to use the laser-printers in the School should select “Postscript” on the word processor for the correct page layout. If you plan to use the School’s facilities for producing your theses you are very strongly encouraged to do test runs well in advance of the deadline to ensure that the document is properly produced.

Computing Contact Numbers

| Computer Account and system inquiries | John Holden  
|                                      | Phone 9351 3024; email john.holden  
|                                       | Nenad Petkovski  
|                                       | Phone 9351 5695; email nenad.petkovski  
| General inquiries | Computer Systems Officers  
|                   | Psychology Helpdesk  
|                   | Phone 9351 2905; email helpdesk  
| Statistical analysis and software inquiries | Dr. Margaret Charles (semester 1)  
|                                                | Rm 452 BM; ph. 9351 3354; email margaret.charles  
|                                                | Dr. Niko Tiliopoulos (semester 1 and 2)  
|                                                | Rm 448 BM; ph. 9036 9223; email niko.tiliopoulos  
| Teaching computer lab, dedicated rooms and general room bookings | Psychology Counter, Psychology Administration Office, 325 Brennan MacCallum (BM)  
|                                                   | NB Bookings are not accepted by email, fax or phone.  
| Access to research facilities | A/Prof. Justin Harris  
|                                    | Rm 478 GT; ph. 9351 2864; email justin.harris  
| Requests for technical assistance | Dr. Barbara Mullan  
|                                          | Rm 446; ph. 9351 6811; email barbara.mullan  
|                                          | http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/Local/techRequest/  

Your responsibilities regarding use of computer resources

Do not abuse your privileges! Students using the School’s computing facilities must produce their SID card if requested to do so by a member of the Psychology staff or a Security Officer. No food or drink is permitted in the computer rooms. Please close windows and turn off lights if you are the last person to leave the room.

The web and printer accesses provided by the School of Psychology are separate from the similar services provided by the University. Students do not need to pay for the web access provided by our School, whereas students have to pay for services (other than e-mail) provided by the University (for more information, see http://helpdesk.usyd.edu.au/services.html).
Use of the internet is monitored, and is strictly for purposes related to your Honours work. As we can trace users, students with unjustified usage (e.g. in the nature of usage, or with extremely high network traffic) may be denied access to the system or asked to pay actual charges.

When using School or University computing facilities, you must observe the University "Conditions of Use" and also its "Code of Conduct". See [http://www.usyd.edu.au/ICTRPolicy/](http://www.usyd.edu.au/ICTRPolicy/)

**It is a criminal offence to:**

(i) Obtain access to data without authority (Penalty 2 years imprisonment)
(ii) Damage, delete, alter or insert data without authority (Penalty 10 years imprisonment)
(iii) Illegally copy copyrighted software ("software piracy"). There are substantial fines and you may be sued for even larger damage claims, see: [http://www.bsa.com.au/bsaweb/main/](http://www.bsa.com.au/bsaweb/main/)

Improper usage of a machine will result in the individual being barred access to the system and more serious steps will be taken if individuals are found to be deliberately attempting to damage or disable ("hack") the system or other people's files.

**Other University computing resources**

Students can also buy access to computing resources at Fisher, Carslaw, Education, and PNR Computer Access Centres (more info: [http://itassist.usyd.edu.au/](http://itassist.usyd.edu.au/)).

**6.4 LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SERVICES**

**6.4.1 SCHOOL LIBRARIES**

(i) **Thesis Library**

The School's Thesis Library contains empirical and theoretical theses submitted over recent years and is located in the Meeting Room, 337 Brennan MacCallum Building. Provided that a class or meeting is not booked into this room, students may borrow theses between 12:30pm and 4pm Mondays to Fridays. Students must obtain access to the room by approaching staff at the Psychology Administration Office (BM 325) and leave their student card at the counter while using the Thesis Library. Two theses can be borrowed at any one time for a period of one week. Students must take the selected thesis to the Psychology Counter to sign the Borrowing Book, and return the thesis back to the Psychology Counter on or before the due date.

(ii) **Test Library**

The Clinical Psychology Unit (CPU) maintains a library of test materials for use by staff and students from the School of Psychology. The library is located in room 123, Transient Building F12. All enquiries should be directed to the test librarian (9363 9236; testlib@psych.usyd.edu.au). Hours of opening are posted on the door of the Test Library and on the test library website ([http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/clinicalpsychology/testlib/](http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/clinicalpsychology/testlib/)). Borrowers can check if a particular item is held by the Test Library by consulting the inventory, available online at [www.psych.usyd.edu.au/TestLibrary/](http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/TestLibrary/).

The Research Collection is comprised of equipment funded by the School of Psychology and from the clinic income and has been set aside for the purpose of research. Borrowing from the Research Collection is limited to academics from the School of Psychology, all Psychology research and Honours students, and their supervisors. The loan period for the Research Collection is up to two weeks, renewable in person and dependent upon other requests for the materials. Library resources are such that consumable test materials (e.g. response forms) will not be supplied for research. Students are liable for the cost of the test if it is incomplete on its return. As with other libraries, graduation will not proceed until these matters are resolved.
6.4.2 THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY LIBRARY

The University of Sydney Library is a distributed system of libraries with a collection of over 5 million items. Fisher Library has the most resources relevant to Psychology and is located on Eastern Avenue, Camperdown Campus.

http://sydney.edu.au/library

Faculty Liaison Librarian

Your Faculty Liaison Librarian supports the teaching, learning and research needs of staff, students and researchers for the School of Psychology. Contact details are as follows:


Psychology Guide

Includes links to Psychology databases, internet resources, information on tests and more.

http://libguides.library.usyd.edu.au/psychology

Psychology material in high demand

Reserve (located on Level 2 of Fisher Library) is a 2 hour loan collection of required and recommended items on Psychology reading lists. Reading list material can be searched by unit of study or lecturer via the catalogue:

http://opac.library.usyd.edu.au/search/r
7 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING WRITTEN WORK

7.1 FORMAT FOR MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS AND THESES

All Theses and Special Fields Major Assignments are independently marked by two examiners. In preparing these items for marking, students must adopt the following format:

(i) Type on A4 paper.
(ii) Minimum font size 10.
(iii) Double or one-and-a-half spacing between lines.
(iv) 2.5 cm margin on all sides.
(v) Provide an abstract.
(vi) Word count (excluding abstract, tables, captions, references and appendices but including in-text citations) to appear on the title page.
(vii) References conform to the American Psychological Association Guidelines for Publication.
(viii) Any material taken from other sources to be properly acknowledged and referenced (author’s name and date given for all references; page number given for direct quotations). Failure to observe this basic convention will be regarded as plagiarism.
(ix) Double-sided printing is recommended.

7.1.1 Word length requirements

The ability to write concisely is an important consideration in assessing the work. Where the required word length is exceeded by 5% or more, the student will be penalised. The title page of each piece of work submitted must include an accurate word count (excluding abstract, tables, captions, references and appendices but including in-text citations).

7.1.2 Receipts for submitted work

When submitting any major piece of written work, except drafts or outlines, students will be provided with a receipt via email. No responsibility will be taken by the School for pieces of work if the student is unable to provide the relevant receipt.

7.2 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BINDING AND SUBMITTING THESES

For both the empirical and theoretical theses, two hard copies of the thesis must be submitted to the Administration Office (BM 325). Each copy must include an abstract (maximum 300 words). An electronic copy of the thesis must also be submitted online to enable plagiarism and word count checks.

The electronic copy must:

• Have a title page with the student’s name and SID
• Contain the following words on the title page: “Theoretical (or Empirical) Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Honours, 2010”, and show an accurate word count.
• Have an acknowledgements page.
• Be submitted via the website:
  

  (login and password will be supplied closer to the submission date)

Two hard copies will be used for the examination process. Each copy:

• Must be bound using plastic spiral or comb binding
• Must not contain the student’s name or SID anywhere
• Must contain the following words on the title page: “Empirical (or Theoretical) Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Honours, 2010”, and show an accurate word count.
• Must contain a raw data disc.
• May be printed using double-sided printing

After examination, please collect one of your examination copies from the Administration Office. Present your SID card upon collection.
7.3 PLAGIARISM

In writing theses, essays or reports to meet coursework requirements, you must use your own words. In some contexts (theoretical research, for example) it is appropriate to use quotations. If you do, this should be indicated in the conventional way - by enclosing the passage within quotation marks and providing citation for the source of the quote, including the page number. In many contexts, especially reports of empirical work, quotations are typically avoided.

Using your own words

“Using your own words” means NOT borrowing from the writing of others – whether from fellow students or published authors. Thus, it is not acceptable to base an essay, for example, on text from various sources, even if you have edited it to some degree, and even if you cite these sources. First of all, there is the ethical issue arising from the dishonesty of presenting as your own work something that is essentially the work of others. In addition, there are good educational reasons for avoiding this, even where you feel that someone else has expressed an idea far more clearly than you could. One reason is the need to learn to express yourself clearly in writing and, like most other skills, this only comes with practice. Another is the failure to demonstrate that you thoroughly understand information or ideas if all you have done is to reproduce, with some editing, what someone else has written about the topic.

As an Honours student, it is no defence to claim that you didn’t realize doing the above constituted plagiarism.

Citing your sources

When you express in your own words what you have learned from various sources, you must cite each source. The standard convention for most written work in psychology is to list references at the end rather than, for example, use footnotes. Expressing an idea without giving a citation implies that it is your own idea. Therefore, if it is in fact an idea from someone else, this must be acknowledged after you have expressed their idea in your own words.

Again, as an Honours student, it is no defence to claim that you didn’t realize not citing the source, even though it is expressed in your words, constituted plagiarism.

Listing a set of sources implies that you have read them all. Therefore, you should list as references only those you have actually read. If you are depending on a secondary source, then make this clear; e.g. ‘... salivary conditioning’ (Pavlov, 1927; cited in Mazur, 1998).

The points made here also apply to non-textual material. For example, graphs or tables of data included in a report should be your own work and not copied from others. Very occasionally you may need to ‘quote’ a figure from some other source; if you do so, you should make its origin quite clear and include the page number.

In general, avoid letting other students use your work for any kind of assessment. On the rare occasion where this could be appropriate, make sure that the other student acknowledges your contribution as the original author. Otherwise what may perhaps have been intended as an act of generosity could have harmful consequences.

The School of Psychology’s policy with regard to coursework based very closely on the work of others is that:

(i) Criteria for marking any piece of submitted coursework include meeting the requirement that the student has used his or her own words in writing it. Similarly, any non-textual content should clearly be the student’s own work. In the rare case (non-theoretical work) that a direct quotation is appropriate, it should be indicated as such by being placed within inverted commas and followed by a reference to the original source, including the page number. If a piece of coursework submitted for assessment is very closely based on the work of others, it will receive a fail and the student will be cautioned, even if the sources are properly cited.

(ii) Where the student has intentionally obscured the fact that some of the content of an essay or report is closely derived from the work of others, it will be treated as a case of misconduct and referred to the Registrar in accordance with the student disciplinary provisions of Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999.
7.4 PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION

You must allow adequate time to complete the final versions of your work and proof-read it before the relevant due date. The amount of time this takes is easily underestimated. If a piece of work is submitted for assessment up to 4 weeks after its due date, it will be marked but will incur an automatic penalty.

For submissions up to 2 days late, 5 marks (out of 100) will be deducted from the final mark.
For submissions from 3 days to one week late, 10 marks will be deducted.
An additional 10 marks will then be deducted for each week after the first week up to the end of the 4th week.

So, if a piece of work is submitted 8 days late, 20 marks will be deducted. **Beyond the 4th week, the work will not be accepted for marking.**

In the case of Special Fields Major Assignments, penalties will apply only to the mark for the particular piece of work that is late. Thus, if only one of the two essays is submitted late, only the mark for the late essay will incur a penalty, but if both are submitted late, both will incur a penalty.

7.5 APPLYING FOR EXTENSIONS OF TIME

Extensions of time will be granted only in cases of serious illness, misadventure or, in the case of Empirical Thesis submission, where there has been an on-going, substantial impediment to progress that is beyond the student’s control. Students requiring an extension must apply in writing to the Honours Co-ordinator, Dr. Fiona Hibberd, no later than 7 days after the due date. Letters of application must include:

(i) the reason for requesting the extension with supporting documentary evidence
(ii) the student’s SID, email address and phone number.

If an extension is sought because of an on-going, substantial impediment to progress on the Empirical Thesis, consideration will only be given if the impediment has been formally documented in the Empirical Research Progress Report submitted in early October.

The following will **not be accepted** as grounds for an extension:

(i) work commitments either in other areas of the Honours programme or in employment
(ii) minor illness (colds, sore throats, headaches, etc.)
(iii) problems associated with getting the document into its final version
(iv) malfunctioning of word-processors, computers, printers; lost data, lost thesis drafts, etc.
(v) power cuts.

7.6 APPLYING FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY EXAM

Students may apply to sit a supplementary exam if illness or misadventure prevented them from taking the original exam. Applications must be made in writing to the Honours Co-ordinator, Dr. Fiona Hibberd, **no later than 7 days** after the exam missed. Letters of application must include:

(i) the reason for requesting the supplementary exam with supporting documentary evidence
(ii) the student’s SID, email address and phone number.

7.7 APPLYING FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

For Honours students in the School of Psychology, all requests for special consideration are dealt with within the School, **not by the Faculty of Science**.

Students may apply for special consideration in cases where illness or misadventure is judged to have affected their performance either across the year in general or in a particular component of the Honours programme. Requests for special consideration will not be accepted if an application for an extension or a supplementary exam has been granted for the same piece of work.
Students requiring special consideration must apply in writing to the Honours Co-ordinator, Dr. Fiona Hibberd, no later than Friday, 22 October, 2010. Letters of application must include:

(i) the reason for requesting special consideration with supporting documentary evidence
(ii) the student’s SID, email address and phone number,

It should be noted that only well-attested serious illness or misadventure will warrant special consideration. Occasional brief or trivial illness will not be regarded as sufficient. Upon receipt of the application, the Honours co-ordinator will meet with the student and will subsequently decide whether the application should be presented at the Honours Examiners’ Meeting in November for the examiners to consider. Typically, the application will only be considered if the student’s rank is such that they have just missed the cut-off for a higher class of Honours degree or just missed being awarded a medal or a prize.
8 SCHOOL ASSESSMENT & EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

Overall assessment is normally based on a weighted sum of each of the four components (see section 2.2), but very poor performance in any one of these components may alone be sufficient to render a candidate ineligible for the award of an Honours degree.

8.1 COURSEWORK MARKING PROCEDURES

8.1.1 DOUBLE MARKING SPECIAL FIELD MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS

Major assignments for Special Fields courses are each marked by two examiners, appointed by the co-ordinator(s) of the relevant Special Field after consultation with the Honours Co-ordinator. The final mark is determined by consultation between the two examiners. If major discrepancies are identified between the examiners that cannot be resolved by consultation, an additional examiner is appointed. Feedback on major assignments will be provided to students when marking is completed.

Checks will be made to ensure equity in marking across Special Fields and, where necessary, some re-scaling of marks will occur.

8.1.2 EXAM MARKING

Exams are not double marked. Marks awarded may subsequently be scaled.

8.2 THESIS MARKING

Empirical and theoretical theses are examined by two members of staff, not including the supervisor. Supervisors submit a report for each student they supervise which is forwarded to relevant examiners (see Appendices F and H). Before reading the Supervisor’s Report Form the examiner assigns a mark out of 100 which s/he subsequently reviews in the light of the supervisor’s report. Marking is based on consideration of those aspects listed on the Examiner’s Report Form (see Appendices G and I). This form is also used in discussions between markers and as a basis for feedback to students after results have been posted.

- The two markers communicate to discuss their evaluations and, where necessary, resolve mark differences.
- The supervisor receives the markers’ initial marks, the resolved mark and the examiners’ reports.
- A 3rd marker will be considered if, and only if, one of the following obtains:
  
  (i) there is a minimum 15 mark discrepancy between markers, or
  (ii) there is a <15 mark discrepancy but at least one examiner is not satisfied with the outcome, or
  (iii) after reading the discussion section of the thesis (at the very least) AND the examiners’ reports, the supervisor still strongly believes that the resolved mark is too low.

- The supervisor has two days to lodge a formal request for a 3rd marker which includes a written argument as to the reasons for the request.
- All three examiners will meet to decide on a final mark. The supervisor may attend this meeting, but only to answer questions from the examiners.
- If the three examiners fail to agree on a single mark, this is conveyed to the Examiners’ meeting (November) where a final mark will be determined.

Following the examiners’ meeting, the student will receive their thesis mark and both examiners’ reports.

NB (i) the examination of theses is very thorough and follows a strict timetable, and (ii) requests for re-marking by students will not be considered.
8.3 CALCULATION OF FINAL HONOURS MARK

8.3.1 PROCEDURE AT EXAMINERS' MEETING

The class of Honours degree awarded is based upon the following principles:

(i) All pieces of work must be submitted by the final deadline before any grade can be awarded.
(ii) The marks for the Empirical Thesis, the Theoretical Thesis/Special Fields, Research Methods, and Ethics are weighted 50%, 30%, 15% and 5% respectively, and the resulting sum out of 100 for each candidate is used to establish an initial rank order of the candidates.
(iii) On the basis of University and School guidelines and other relevant factors, the Honours Examiners' Meeting determines the minimum final raw mark criterion for each Honours band.
(iv) Note that the raw-scaling criterion for Hons 1 in the School of Psychology is 85. Final raw marks are rescaled to conform with the University-wide Honours scale (Hons 1: 80-100; Hons 2.1: 75-79; Hons 2.2: 70-74; Hons 3: 65-69). Therefore, your final raw mark will differ from your final Honour mark. It is the latter which is recommended to Faculty and which appears on your academic transcript.

If any changes to the above occur during 2010, students will be notified.

8.3.2 FACULTY REQUIREMENTS AND TRANSCRIPTS OF RESULTS

The School Examiners' meeting makes a recommendation to the relevant Faculty regarding the mark and award for each candidate. This recommendation is usually accepted, provided that Faculty's requirements are also met. In the Faculty of Arts, it was stipulated by the 1998 Board of Examiners that there should generally be no more than 10 marks difference between the student's final recommended Honours mark and that student's performance in the third year of their Honours subject. In the Faculty of Science, the undergraduate WAM must be at least 80 for the University Medal and questions will be asked of the School if there is a substantial difference between the student’s WAM and their final Honours mark. Faculty requirements apply unless it can be demonstrated that the WAM was affected by sickness, misadventure, an unusually high academic work load, and/or that performance in the Honours unit of study was exceptional. Students who consider their WAM to have been affected by exceptional circumstances and who are concerned that their final Honours grade may be unfairly prejudiced because of this, should write to the Dean explaining the circumstances and provide documentation where appropriate. A copy of any correspondence should be forwarded to the Honours Co-ordinator. This will allow the school to be informed about your case when it is considered by the Faculty Board of Examiners at the end of the year.

8.4 HONOURS PRIZES AND AWARDS

The University Medal

A bronze medal awarded by the Faculties of Science and Arts to the top candidates in the 4th year Honours programme with First Class Honours where the candidate's work across the entire course of their undergraduate degree is of outstanding merit.

The Australian Psychological Society Prize in Psychology

This annual prize is donated by the Australian Psychological Society (APS). It’s a free one-year associate membership to the APS and an invitation to present at the annual APS conference. It’s awarded to the student who achieved the highest overall mark in Fourth Year Psychology.

The O'Neil Prize

The Dick Thomson Prize


The Dick Champion Prize

Established in 1999 by the School of Psychology to perpetuate the memory of Professor Dick Champion, a former Head of the School of Psychology. This prize is awarded annually on the recommendation of the Head of the School of Psychology to the Honours student who presents the best Empirical Thesis in the areas of learning or motivation, providing the thesis is of sufficient merit. Value $200.
9 POSTGRADUATE STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

You are strongly encouraged to consider postgraduate research and training, either in a research-only (PhD or MSc) or clinical degree (DCP/MSc). The information provided below applies to Sydney University, but you should consider a range of options, with a view to optimising the match with your research and professional interests.

9.1 RESEARCH-ONLY POSTGRADUATE DEGREES (PhD OR MSc)

A research degree encompasses a substantial project, often involving a series of studies, that addresses and reaches some resolution of a research question independently developed by the student in consultation with their supervisor. Additional coursework requirements, such as presentation and participation in seminars, need to be met during candidature.

Postgraduate research is suited to students who have enjoyed the experience of conducting independent research, usually in their Honours year. If there is an area of psychology you find sufficiently engaging to want to devote three years to researching, then you should consider enrolling in a research degree. The skills you acquire during your candidature will prepare you for work in academia as well for a broader range of research / policy development positions in the government or private sector.

PhD and MSc degree applications should be lodged by the end of October. Offers of places are based on your Honours performance and the availability of supervision. A First Class Honours degree is necessary to be eligible for PhD candidature, but if you have applied for a PhD and obtain Second Class Honours, you can be offered MSc candidature, which you can apply to upgrade to a PhD at the end of your first year of candidature.

As part of your application for a postgraduate research degree you need to provide a brief research proposal and indicate that you have contacted a potential supervisor. Note that you do not have to continue with the same supervisor or research area as your Honours project.

For information about how to apply, including application forms, go to:

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/info/postgrad/

For research degree enquiries, contact A/Prof. Pauline Howie (BM 424, phone 9351 2001, email pauline.howie@sydney.edu.au).

9.2 DOCTOR OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY/MASTER OF SCIENCE (DCP/MSC)

At the University of Sydney clinical training is provided through a postgraduate double degree, the Doctor of Clinical Psychology/Master of Science (DCP/MSc). Applications close on the last Friday in October. There is no mid-year entry. For information about application, go to:


For enquiries, contact Ms Belinda Ingram Ph. 9351 6180; Email belinda.ingram@sydney.edu.au

Procedures and criteria for selecting DCP/MSc applicants

Universities differ in their criteria for selection for professional courses and will not necessarily use the same procedures. At the University of Sydney, selection is based on submitted application materials, followed by an interview of selected applicants conducted by an interview panel comprising at least two academic staff members, with at least one being internal (academic or clinical staff from the Clinical Psychology Unit). Additional interview panel members include academics from the School of Psychology. Only those applicants with Honours 2.1 or above will be considered for the course. From this pool, applicants are selected for interviews on the basis of:

(i) Academic records: undergraduate academic performance and postgraduate (i.e. MSc, PhD) qualifications in Psychology (where applicable)
(ii) Publications: published journal articles, published reports, conference presentations
(iii) Relevant work experience (including voluntary work or relevant research assistance)
(iv) Two satisfactory referees' reports.
Note that only a limited number of interviews are conducted. The interview process assesses relevant academic, research and work experience performance, aptitude for clinical psychology and awareness of ethical issues relevant to clinical practice.

NOTE: It is NOT a requirement for acceptance into the DCP/MSc that a student must have completed an empirical or theoretical thesis in the area of Abnormal, Clinical or Health Psychology. The selection process aims to identify students with a demonstrated interest in abnormal or clinical psychology, an awareness of clinical issues, and experience related to the area, but this can be demonstrated in a number of ways. Furthermore, projects in many areas of psychology (e.g., Cognitive, Developmental, Individual Differences, Human Learning, Neuroscience, Perception, Social Psychology) may have clinical relevance or implications.

For more information on the content of and selection process for the DCP/MSc, visit the Clinical Psychology Unit website:

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/clinicalpsychology

9.3 COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATE DEGREES AND DIPLOMAS

Master of Applied Science (Health Psychology)

Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma programs in Health Psychology are offered. For further information, go to:

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/info/health/

For enquiries, contact Dr Barbara Mullan  Ph. 9351 6811 ; email barbara.mullan@sydney.edu.au

Master of Applied Science (Psychology of Coaching)

Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma programs in Psychology of Coaching are also offered. For further information, go to:

http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/info/coach/

For enquiries, contact Dr Tony Grant  Ph. 9351 6792 ; email anthony.grant@sydney.edu.au

9.4 POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

Australian Postgraduate Research Awards (APAs) are available for local research students only. There is a very strict application deadline (usually the end of October), so if there is any possibility that you may want to undertake postgraduate studies next year, you should apply for a scholarship before this date. Application forms are available on the postgraduate website (see above). University Postgraduate Awards (UPAs) are also available for students who narrowly miss out on APAs, or continuing students (who are already enrolled in a postgraduate degree).

You need to have First Class Honours in order to be considered for an APA or UPA. In some situations a case can be made for Hons 1 equivalence based on completed Masters degrees with substantial research components, but essentially this is for graduates of more than 5 years’ standing with a high level of research output and experience.

These awards are based on a weighted combination of Honours mark, undergraduate performance, and a Research Potential Indicator (RPI) based on publications and conference presentations. Most students with Hons 1 and a good undergraduate record will be successful in being awarded an APA or UPA, but students who miss out can work on increasing their RPI and re-apply in subsequent years. For mid year entry (commencing Semester 2), some UPAs are offered to continuing students, but there may also be Science Faculty UPAs for commencing students only, so students who believe they can increase their RPI may be advised to delay commencement until Semester 2.

Note that highly ranked students for the APA may also be awarded top-up scholarships (varying values), either by the University or the School.
As coursework degree students are not eligible for APAs or UPAs, DCP/MSc students should apply at the end of their second year, when they are about to begin the full time research degree component of the program. Note however that the requirement for Honours 1 or equivalent still holds.

International postgraduate research students can apply for Endeavour International Postgraduate Research (IPRS) or University International Scholarships (USydIS). These are highly competitive and First Class Honours or equivalent is a minimum requirement. These scholarships are awarded to commencing students only (unless a currently enrolled student could not be considered at commencement because of the timing of their application).

There is no separate application form for international scholarships. Applicants simply indicate that they wish to be considered for the scholarships in the relevant section of their Postgraduate Research Application form. To be considered for a scholarship, applicants must submit their postgraduate application by 31 July (for Semester 1 commencement) or 31 December (for Semester 2 commencement), and receive a firm offer of postgraduate candidature (without English Language conditions) by mid September (for Semester 1 commencement) or late February (for Semester 2 commencement).

For information about international fees and other scholarships go to:


The Scholarships Office can also be contacted on 61 2 8627 8112

Other Funding:

The School of Psychology offers a number of scholarships for which only research students enrolled in the School are eligible to apply:

- Margaret Stewart Scholarship, for postgraduate candidates conducting research into relationships between ethics and behaviour. Equivalent to APA
- Lucy Firth Scholarship currently $16,500/annum for up to 3 years for F/T PhD student
- Winifred O’Neill Scholarship up to $3,570 p.a. for FT PhD candidate for up to 2 yrs. Based on meritorious performance in UG Psychology. Preference to students with visual impairment or other disability
- Campbell Perry International Research Scholarship, for APA (or equivalent) holders, normally in their 2nd year of candidature (up to $6,000 for 2-8 weeks travel to relevant research group/institution).

Other funding available to research students for specialist research and/or travel to conferences includes:

- School Postgraduate Research Grants
- School Travel Allowance
- University Postgraduate Research Support Scheme

Research students in the School of Psychology also benefit from:

- Well-equipped labs in a variety of areas
- Your own desk and computer
- Opportunity to be employed as a casual tutor
- School support for social and other activities
APPENDIX A

OBTAINING ETHICS APPROVAL

EXTRACT FROM 2009 ETHICS APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH USING PSYCH 1 STUDENTS AS SUBJECTS

A copy of the full ethics protocol and the protocol approval number can be found at

http://sydney.edu.au/science/psychology/teach/psyc4

A central part of students' fourth year in Psychology is the completion of a research project. These projects are designed and carried out in close consultation with a supervisor who is a member of the academic staff of the School of Psychology. In some cases there is also an external supervisor who is an appropriately qualified academic or researcher in a related institution. The general purpose of these projects is to provide training in research methods in Psychology. This is required for eligibility for graduate membership of the Australian Psychological Society. It is also a prerequisite for registration as a professional psychologist, and for entry into most postgraduate courses in Psychology.

In addition, the aim of each fourth year project is to further knowledge in a particular area of Psychology. It is a course requirement that these projects do not simply replicate previous research, but rather make an independent contribution to knowledge in that area. Consequently, some of these projects are published in professional journals or presented at professional conferences.

The procedures used in these projects are of two main types:

TYPE 1 EXPERIMENTS

These consist of experiments which investigate aspects of various psychological processes such as memory, learning, skilled performance, problem solving, pattern recognition, attention, perception. Typically, they employ the presentation of some kind of stimulus material (for example, words or visual patterns presented on a computer screen, on cards or projected; words or other auditory stimuli presented via headphones or a loudspeaker) and participants are required to respond in some manner, either immediately or at a later time, as in memory experiments. Such responses may involve pressing an appropriate key, tracking a moving target, selecting from an array of items in a recognition test, or psycho-physiological measures such as changes in skin conductance or heart rate.

Type 1 experiments use one or more of the following procedures:

1. reaction times measured by keyboard press, mouse button or voice key
2. presentation of visual stimuli (including faces, alphanumeric characters, geometric forms) on computer monitors, cards, or projected onto a screen
3. presentation of auditory stimuli, including words, melodies, single tones or complex sounds via headphones or loudspeakers
4. presentation of tactile stimuli, such as weak vibrations applied to the finger-tips via a conventional vibrotactile device.
5. presentations of combinations of the visual, auditory or tactile stimuli described above
6. assessment of body shape of photographic images
7. recording of eye position using infra red sensing device or video-photography memory tasks, involving words, faces, video-taped events, other visual or auditory patterns, odours
8. reasoning tasks, including arithmetic, anagram and concept formation tasks
9. memory tasks, involving works, faces, video-taped events, or other visual or auditory patterns
10. presentation of computer-simulated driving tasks, and measurements of steering, accelerator and brake responses
11. tracking tasks involving continuous responding to changing visual or auditory patterns
12. motor tasks involving grip strength, throwing or motor discrimination tasks
13. non-invasive electrophysiological measures: cardiovascular, heart rate monitors using an ear lobe clip, electroencephalographic (EEG), skin conductance, electromyographic and electro-oculographic measures
14. evaluation of transfer of training on a variety of computer tasks - e.g. library database searches
15. judgement of food or drink flavours and sniffed odours, and consumption of commonly available food and drinks
16. Perceptual tasks involving judgement of visual, auditory or tactile stimuli, or combinations of these.
TYPE 2 EXPERIMENTS

These are usually employed in Health and Social Psychology projects or cognate areas. They involve the administration of a self-report questionnaire or test, which is either a standard instrument (for example, kinds of personality, mood or ability tests) or an instrument which has been specifically developed for a specific study. Such projects cover diverse topics, for example, rating perceptions of health risks, rating the importance of various aspects of friendship.

Type 2 experiments use one or more of the following procedures:

1. various standard intelligence tests
2. various standard personality tests
3. various standard tests assessing mood and emotional state
4. standard format tests of associations between words and concepts
5. widely available questionnaires on attitudes, including measures of prejudice, stereotypes and attitudes
6. questionnaires covering various aspects of behaviour, for example, social interactions, eating behaviour, recreational behaviours.
7. questionnaires requiring estimates of the likelihood of future events, for example, health related, accidents, academic performance
8. Journal-keeping or diarising of behaviour or mood

If your study does not fall into one of the categories listed above, you will have to obtain individual approval for your study from the Ethics Committee (Human or Animal). Alternatively, if your study is closely aligned with an existing protocol held by your supervisor, you must have your name added to that protocol. The appropriate course of action should be discussed with your supervisor. Please note that you cannot commence your research until you obtain approval from the Ethics Committee.

UNIVERSITY ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND APPLICATION DEADLINES 2010

For dates, refer to the following URLs:

APPENDIX B

ETHICS DECLARATION FORM FOR TYPE 1 OR TYPE 2 PROJECTS COVERED BY THE STANDARD HONOURS APPROVAL (REFER TO APPENDIX A)

This form must be submitted electronically.

Go to http://sydney.edu.au/science/psychology/teach/psych4 to access the form and follow instructions

Name of Student______________________________________________________________

SID________________________________________

Email________________________________________  Supervisor _______________________

Working title of empirical project ______________________________________________

Nature of research: Human – using PSYC1001 and/or PSYC1002 participants

Ethics Protocol Approval Number: _________________________

Type of experiment to be conducted (see Appendix A; list more than one where applicable):

Type 1  or  Type 2

Please explain why your study is a Type 1 or Type 2 experiment:

When submitting this form, please ensure you also submit an electronic copy of your debrief for student participants to be forwarded to the subject pool coordinator (see Appendix C for details).

NB. If your study is not a Type 1 or Type 2 investigation you will need to either:

a)  Apply individually to the Ethics Committee for approval, or

b)  Be added to you supervisor’s existing protocol.

Do not submit this form.
ETHICS DECLARATION FORM FOR TYPE 1 OR TYPE 2 PROJECTS COVERED BY THE STANDARD HONOURS APPROVAL

The following covers the key questions in the standard Human Ethics application form relevant to research of the type covered in the group application. It is important that you indicate below that you have thought carefully about the ethical implications of your study and have anticipated any problems which might arise.

DEBRIEFING

The debriefing is a 100-word description of the aims of your study to be provided to participants after they have been tested. To be submitted with your request for subjects.

Will you debrief each participant immediately after testing?  YES  NO

If no, explain why it is necessary to delay debriefing.

CONCEALMENT/DECEPTION

Clearly participants must be naïve to your hypotheses: circle “YES” only if concealment goes beyond this.

Will the true purpose of the research be concealed from participants?  YES  NO

IF “YES”, provide details of the concealment and how and when participants will be debriefed.

STRESS/ADVERSE EFFECTS

Will the research induce any psychological or physical stress or otherwise adversely affect the participant?  YES  NO

If YES, your project is NOT covered by the group application and you will need to submit an individual application to the Human Ethics Committee.

I understand that:

1. I must ensure the confidentiality of data collected, including the identity of the participants, by:
   • not revealing to any person not directly connected with the project information of a personal nature provided by participants
   • keeping data stored securely, both during and after the study
   • ensuring that the data is stored in a way that does not identify individual participants by name

2. There is a legal requirement that data be retained for at least 7 years after completion of research, and that when data is disposed of, this must be done in a secure manner.

Signed_________________________________________________  Date______________________
This section describes how Honours students who require human subjects may recruit 1st year students to participate in studies.

The subject pool administrator is: Dr Caleb Owens, Brennan MacCallum 453, caleb.owens@sydney.edu.au

Note that the School of Psychology has only used the SONA experiment appointment software since 2009 so your own experience signing up in first year (and your supervisor’s experience) might be a little out of date.

Key issues for Honours students recruiting first year students:

• **You have limited hours to test.** The subject pool is a limited resource. Each semester it is no more than 5000 hours (closer to 4000 hours in Semester 2). Honours students are permitted to use no more than 60 hours per semester; postgraduate students are permitted 100 hours per semester. This means that only a handful of researchers could deplete the entire pool if everyone used their maximum allocation. Thankfully not all researchers use their maximum allocation, and there is generally enough to go around. Be mindful of the limit from the very beginning of your project:
  o The limit is strictly enforced – do not waste hours, and do not plan a project which clearly requires more than the limited number of hours. If your supervisor places pressure on you in regard to statistical power, simply tell them that the particular project may not be practical with the first year subject pool. If they want to do it then you will need to find funding and pay participants. Realistically though, why would you plan an Honours projects in search of an effect which is so hard to detect, so unreliable, or so small (and practically insignificant) that hundreds of subjects would be required? Start reading results sections of papers and find an effect which can be found reliably with 30-40 participants per study.
  o There is no point planning a project hoping to get more hours when the pool “opens”. It is true that at the end of Semester 1 limits are usually removed for the last few weeks, but competition becomes so fierce (with 70+ studies available) that any extra hours cannot be relied upon. Note importantly that the pool often opens in Semester 2 as well, but that occurs AFTER Honours theses are due.

• **You do not have to use all your hours!** In 2009 Honours students seemed intent on using up all their research hours regardless of whether they needed them. More is not better. Using just the right number of subjects to detect the effect you want, and no more, is a sign of your research skill. Using four times the number of subjects such that every last interaction contrast is significant and your discussion is mired is neither elegant nor useful.

• **You cannot trade hours.** It’s always been against the rules for supervisors to give students their unused hours; yet every year supervisors try. It does not matter if your Honours project is part of a larger research project with shared ethics with a dozen other researchers. Work within your own limits always.

• **You do not have to wait for your proposal to be reviewed in order to start testing.** Of course feedback is useful, but with proposals only sent out for review in April and some of them coming back much later, it is best to start planning and even start testing before you hear back. A sensible strategy might be to run a pilot study to establish the basic effect you are looking for. Simply starting testing of some kind might be found reliably with 30-40 participants per study.

• **Treat the subject pool as a limited resource.** Do not waste hours; do not give away more credit time than what each subject has earned, and do not offer enticements like double the credit time or travel time. Credits are limited, and they are linked to course marks, so making up your own uses for them represents serious misconduct.

• **Honours is, in part, a demonstration of your research management skills.** Too often Honours students feel pressure to produce publishable research, and miss the point that the Honours year is simply about demonstrating critical thinking and research skills (and later writing skills). Many Honours students might benefit from a hundred extra hours or so in order to run another three studies and “finish” everything; but this is not what Honours is about and anxiety over creating the perfect project is misplaced. Research at any level is always faced with limits, and making the most of what you have will always be your number one concern.

• **SONA runs with university email addresses at its core.** If you have left it until Honours to find out how to access your university email address, then it is time to do it. If you must rely on web based email
Subject pool policy for Honours students

Each Honours student is permitted to use no more than 60 hours per semester, and these hours may not be carried over semesters. Projects should be planned with this key restriction in mind. Subject hours may be added together if you collaborate with colleagues on an experiment. However supervisors cannot allocate their own research hours to you even if they do not plan to use this time themselves.

Who uses the subject pool?

The subject pool is a finite asset of the School of Psychology. Because it consists of 1st Year Psychology students, only experiments concerning this population are appropriate. However many researchers also use the pool as a source of control subjects in their developmental or abnormal psychology studies. Because of limitations in subject pool usage, studies which require large numbers of subjects are usually not possible without extensive collaborations. And some researchers may not feel comfortable explaining the full nature of their studies to students, even after all participants have been run. A consideration of the educational requirements of the psychology students involved however should be uppermost in researcher’s minds so if a full debrief is not possible within the semester a study is conducted then this subject pool should not be used.

Getting the most out of your research hours

• Consider the nature of your research and the statistical power required. More is not always better, and if a crude approach to research is not possible within the constraints of the subject pool a more elegant design (e.g. a within-subjects design if possible) may be the solution.
• If your experiment runs a fraction of an hour, consider collaborating with other researchers to create a slot advertised as a single experiment which consists of several small studies.
• Consider the demand for and supply of studies throughout both semesters when planning when to conduct research (supply refers to the number of experiments available, demand refers to the likelihood students will sign-up):
  o Early Semester 1 - Low supply, moderate demand (Honours projects not yet running)
  o Mid Semester 1 – Moderate supply, high demand (Some Honours projects but students increasingly keen to ‘finish’ their hours)
  o Late Semester 1 – High supply, high demand (busy all round and often hard for less ‘popular’ experiments to get a foothold)
  o Early Semester 2 – High supply, high demand (Honours projects start from Week 1, and students are fully aware of the system by now)
  o Mid Semester 2 – Moderate supply, moderate demand
  o Late Semester 2 – Low supply, moderate demand (Honours projects have finished, but students still keen to complete their hours)
  o The last day of testing in each semester is the last day of stuvac.

Consider testing in the break between Semesters 1 & 2. You do not receive extra hours to do this, but it is considerably more relaxed with less competition for lab space. Because SONA will not be working, you will need to recruit potential subjects and manage appointments yourself; keeping in mind that credits can only be earned by students for PSYC1002. Do not give PSYC1001 students the impression they can earn ‘late’ credits for a course which has finished. If students complete holiday experiments, you can then credit the students formally once SONA comes up again.

Overview of the online sign-up system

The Psychology 1 students making up the entire subject pool are registered in the online SONA system at the beginning of semester as participants. Also at the beginning of each semester, all research staff and students we are aware of (including Honours students) will be registered in the SONA system as researchers. Your login is your UNIKEY. Your password is randomly generated, so the first time you log in go to the SONA website and then in the bottom left go to: “Lost your password? Click Here to Retrieve It!” You can use this feature any time you need your password. You clearly must be able to access your university email.

As everyone is registered to begin with, this means that researchers will be able to enter experiment information online and prepare for testing from a very early date. Before participants are able to sign up for experiments however, researchers must lodge their ethics approvals and debriefs and request approval.

Studies are advertised online with a brief description, location, and timeslots. Students can then register for the times which they wish to attend the study. After each student has participated in the experiment, the

1 In late Semester 1 and Early Semester 2, demand for experiments reaches it high points of the year, yet paradoxically this is when researchers are most likely to claim that students ‘are not signing up’. This perception arises because the sheer number of experiments available (up to 80) means that even record high demand is spread very thin.
You should not credit students for time spent travelling to an off-campus location beyond the hour and finish 5 minutes before the hour. Travel time does NOT refer to extensive travel time for off-campus location. Understand the university 5 minute rule about travelling which removes 10 minutes at the beginning and end of any study.

The most common change the pool coordinator will make to your description concerns time. The system keeps track of how much credit students have accumulated, and how much credit experimenters have used up.

### Placing your experiment online
Go to the SONA website, login, and create an experiment for yourself.
The url is: http://sydneypsych.sona-systems.com/

### Step 1. Entering information online

Once logged in as a researcher, start by selecting “Add new study”. There are four options, choose the one that is appropriate. Note that if your study requires multiple appointments, the easiest approach is to use SONA to arrange the first appointment, and then make further appointments yourself directly with the participants.

Next, enter the basic information about your study: name, a brief abstract which contains a few sentences summarizing what you study involves, and a more detailed description which allows you to clearly specify the nature of the study and what participants will be required to do.

These descriptions also function as advertisements for participants, however please restrain yourself from going beyond a basic description of your study. The use of more than one exclamation mark in a row is forbidden. Phrases like “easy” and “fun” are forbidden (these words are often misleading and also disadvantage researchers who conduct research which is not fun). Most importantly phrases which imply that more credit is being given out than is being earned are strictly forbidden. **There is no need to mention time or credit at all** (put this information in the duration and credit boxes below). The only situation where you might want to discuss time or credit in this section, might be if there are multiple sessions; in such a case phrases like “You must complete all sessions of the study to receive any credit” are useful. Casual statements such as “lots of slots available” and “last days” are inappropriate, and are no longer practical anyway as these descriptions cannot be casually changed.

**Note importantly:** After approval, changes to the study details will result in the study being automatically removed from visibility, and re-approval must be sought. **The system does not warn you before it does this,** but it certainly tells you once the changes are made that it has hidden your experiment! **Importantly, participants who have already signed up are retained.** SONA has simply prevented you from recruiting any more for the time being. You can change many other details without fear of your experiment being hidden: for example location (you might not have booked rooms yet), or sign-up deadline, are things you may need to change frequently. However if participants have already signed up, there are other key details you cannot change, such as credits awarded. For example it would be unethical to advertise a study as offering 2 credit points, then reduce this to 1 credit point once participants had given their consent. If you notice any changes have been made to the description after it is approved, it might be because the pool coordinator noticed a problem and corrected it for you (e.g. typo, inappropriate ad, mention of time in description – the slots have location fields). If the correction is inappropriate, make the change and send through a reapproval request.

Before you enter any information into eligibility requirements consider making use of the pre-screening responses. Many basic demographic features do not require ethics approval to use. You can simply type “males only” into this box, or you could tell SONA that you only want people who said they were male to be able to see your experiment (see Pre-screening section below).

When calculating the duration of the experiment, include travel time\(^2\), time between participants, extra time for questions, and variation in how long each participant might actually take. Most experiments offer credit for half an hour or an hour. Make sure the duration matches the credits, where 1 hour equals 1 credit. Also, if your study has between subject conditions which run for different times (i.e. Condition 1 is 30min but Condition 2 is 50min) then separate them into two different studies at sign-up. In such a situation you cannot randomly allocate participants because they have already signed an agreement based on a particular study duration. If your study involves extensive waiting time (e.g. to wait for a drug to have an effect, or a retention interval in a memory study), and it is not practical to schedule two sessions, consider teaming up with another researcher who can complete meaningful research in that gap (e.g. a retention interval of 30 minutes might be filled with a ‘distractor task’ which is actually a real self contained experiment run by another research). In this case researchers send a joint application and place only one study advertisement which contains descriptions of all the components.

**The most common change the pool coordinator will make to your description concerns time.** Too many studies initially contain phrases like: “This 45 minute study…” , when the time listed is for a 1 hour study. Students understand the university 5 minute rule about travelling which removes 10 minutes at the beginning and end of each hour. Putting statements like this makes the advertisement more coercive and possibly deceptive since most

---

\(^2\) Reasonable travel time at Uni is 10 minutes, hence all lectures, tutorials (and studies in this case) should start at 5 minutes past the hour and finish 5 minutes before the hour. Travel time does NOT refer to extensive travel time for off-campus studies. You should not credit students for time spent travelling to an off-campus location.
studies take different students different amounts of time. Rather than send emails back and forth to try to explain this to you, the pool coordinator will most likely just remove the phrases from your description; however if it is clear your study will consistently run under time, you are wasting subjects pool hours as well as your own hours, and your study will not be approved.

Preparation might include information like “please do not eat or drink less than 6 hours before the study”, but most researchers will leave it blank.

You will see that you can select more than one researcher to have access to the study. Ensure you include all the researchers who are contributing hours, however decide beforehand with your collaborators who will be in charge of administering the online sign-ups or things could get very confusing.

Include your Human Ethics Committee Approval Code if you are not an Honours researcher.

If you are ready to begin testing make your study active, and press the request approval button. Once approved it will appear to students. If you are still preparing, then select no to keep it inactive.

Consider prerequisite and disqualifier experiments, respectively studies which participants have to have done or must not have done to sign up for yours. If other researchers are performing similar experiments or if you yourself are running several versions of the same experiment, these are important. By default, no participant can sign up for the same study more than once – if you wish them to be able to, select yes to this question at the option further down.

Using an invitation code is useful for studies in which participants are directly contacted via email after a selection or screening process or during the mid-year holidays. Ethics approval is required for direct contact, and ensure your potential subjects have given their consent to be contacted.

If your study is web based then there is a place for you to include the url. You will need to develop a system which insures the anonymity of your participants, but also allows you to return to SONA and credit them. Do not collect data from an online study if you have no way of recording which participants have completed it.

The participant sign-up deadline is the minimum time before an experiment runs that participants can sign up. If your experiment takes an hour to set up then set it to one hour, however if you want to be able to see your subjects for the next day (so you know when you have to wake up and be in the lab), set the lead time to 24 hours so there are no surprises. It is common for researchers to increase lead time at the end of each week to prevent participants signing up over the weekend and surprising them on Monday.

Finally if you wish to have more or less than 100 hours allocated to the experiment (or more or less than 60 hours if you are an Honours student), explain this in the “private comments” section of the study information (the very last box). Please also include in this box the more specific contact details of the researcher in charge of managing the online system (i.e. their mobile number). Students will not be able to see this.

Once your information is entered online, email the subject pool coordinator the required documents. IMPORTANT: For a prompt approval of your study, try to email documents and click the “request” approval button in close proximity (see below). Too often researchers send through their ethics days or even weeks before the study approval request (or days after). It is hard to match up documentation with such a large gap.

Step 2. Lodge Documents with subject pool administrator via email

The following documents must be lodged with the subject pool coordinator via email (electronically). Send emails to caleb.owens@sydney.edu.au, with the required documents in either PDF or WORD format as attachments to the email (not in the body). If you only have hardcopies, a scanner is available in the graphics lab (GT level 4).

1. Ethics approval OR Ethics declaration

If you are an Honours student whose research is covered by blanket approval¹, please submit an exact copy of your ethics declaration that you would have also submitted as part of your research proposal. All other researchers need to submit a copy of their approval letter from the HREC committee. Note that using the pre-screening survey raises ethical issues. If you do not include information about how you intend to use the pre-screening responses (and approval for this) but are found to be using it, then your study will be removed.

---

¹ Refer to the Ethics section of the Honours handbook to determine if your study will be covered by blanket approval (i.e. Type 1 and 2 studies). If your study involves mood or self-esteem manipulation or serious deception then it most certainly is not covered. Discuss with your supervisor whether it is worth applying for external ethics or simply changing the design. If supervisors conduct similar research, they may be able to add you to their protocol with a simple amendment.
2. Subject debrief

All subjects must be fully debriefed at the end of each study. Verbally debriefing subjects is always the best way, and often gives researchers the best insights into whether subjects were completing the experiment as expected. However this is not always possible, and does not allow for students to reflect on their experience later, so all researchers must create a written debrief for their study which can be either handed to participants or emailed to them once the study is completed.

The debriefing information must include:

- the title of the experiment
- the researchers involved and the email of the researcher in charge of running the study
- when the experiment was run / will be run (e.g. Semester 1: Weeks 6-8)
- a description of the experiment and what was actually done
- a background to the experiment, involving a theoretical and practical justification for what was done
- expected results and their meaning in straightforward terms
- at least 2 references to previous research relating to the current research (in APA format so they can be found)
- It should be approximately 500-1000 words, and may include diagrams, graphs or pictures. For Honours students, a reasonable debrief is often made by editing your research proposal and making it more readable for a 1st year audience.

Note: Students must be fully debriefed for every study they have completed at the end of each semester. Studies which require a year long deception or studies which can never be explained fully cannot be run.

Once you have lodged your documents via email and entered the information online, your study may be approved and can be made visible. Ensure you return to SONA to the study information section and where it says Approved there should be a hyperlink called Send an approval request.

Step 3. Managing your experiment

- Creating slots: Log in to SONA and go to my studies > the study you want > view / administer timeslots > add a timeslot. You can see that for each timeslot you can have a different location, and there are several ways to add multiple timeslots. Note importantly that when you enter the time for each timeslot, use the 24 hour time system or specify AM or PM. For example if you want to run a study at 145pm, then enter 13:45 or enter 1:45pm. If you just enter “1:45” then you will create a timeslot at 145am in the morning!
- Crediting participants: Once the study appointment time has come and gone, return to the view/administer timeslots page and your will see under the ‘recent timeslots’ list that participants are listed as awaiting action. Click on ‘modify’ for the timeslot, go to the sign-ups section of the next screen and select the appropriate option:
  o Participated: is what you select if the participant did complete the study (or make a serious attempt before discontinuing). Note that you can change the amount of credit awarded just in case the study goes over time.
  o No-show (Penalty Assessed): is what you should select if the participant has not arrived within 15 minutes of their appointment time (or sooner for shorter studies). Once this action is taken, students often immediately email with an excuse. It is up to the individual researcher to negotiate a new appointment time (outside SONA, then the same slot can be returned to and credited later), or to change the judgement to ‘no-show (no-penalty)” if the student provides documentation demonstrating why they could not attend. Note that while students might consider it polite to contact researchers less than 24 hours before the experiment is due to begin to say they cannot make it, they should still be penalized if their excuse is not valid since they have still disrupted the research by preventing others from signing up.
  o No-show (No Penalty): is for situations where you cannot be there for the study. If you are giving this notice >24 hours before the study is due to commence, use the comments to apologize to students, and perhaps ask them to sign up again. If you have to cancel the study <24 hours before it is due to begin, do not select this option, select “Participated” instead because students given <24 hours notice deserve credit and you deserve to be penalized4. Also, this no-show option means the same subject can sign up for your study again. Therefore it should not be considered an option for researchers reluctant to penalize – if that’s the reason you are selecting this option, then the same unreliable student will be able to disrupt your study again and again until you do penalize them.
  o No Action Taken: This is the setting the timeslot begins with. Note that if you are not continually checking and accounting for slots by either crediting or penalizing students, then “No Action

---

4 The worst case scenario for any researcher is to be absent on a day when huge numbers of subjects are booked in to be run. If you are running 60 hours of subject hours in one day, make sure there is someone who can take your place, or if you suffer a misadventure you will be forced to forgo your entire quota by having to credit a large number of angry students.
Use of Pre-screening tool for recruiting participants

Before the beginning of each semester, the Pre-screen Coordinator (Lisa Zadro, lisa.zadro@sydney.edu.au) will ask for submissions regarding the pre-screening survey. All students are given the option the complete the survey the first time they log on to SONA. The survey begins with a general section asking about basic demographics and common study requirements. Further sections consist of questions contributed by individual researchers who have ethics approval to pre-screen for various variables.

If you have HREC ethics approval to pre-screen there is no guarantee your pre-screen questions will be included. The pre-screening questionnaire cannot be longer than 30min in total. Limit your number of questions, and consider how many other researchers or labs are likely to be contributing the same questionnaire. Do not submit a long questionnaire that is unlikely to be useful to anyone else and expect it to be included. Consider that **no data from the pre-screen is made available to anyone, not even you**. Rather than try to include a full 34 point clinical scale, the data for which will be lost anyway, consider a shorter version since you will have to give the longer version in the study itself.

Researchers with HREC ethics approval to pre-screen should be aware of their responsibilities if certain students who may need assistance are identified.

For researchers who have not contributed a questionnaire themselves (or are not listed on a project which has HREC approval to pre-screen), you **cannot make use of clinical or other research scales to pre-screen for your own subjects**. However the pre-screen begins will a “basic demographics” section which everyone can use and which can be very helpful.

Basic demographics questions are things like: sex, language, age, religion, smoking status etc. Researchers and research groups should ask Lisa Zadro before each semester if the categories they require are represented. For example the language option “Mandarin” might not meet your needs, because you need to know if a person is a native speaker.

The pre-screening tool works like this. Begin by going to the ‘study information screen’, then select **Prescreen restrictions – View/Modify Restrictions**. Select the sections you wish to use then click on **set restrictions**. For each question, select the responses which correspond to the participants you require for the study. If you return to the **study pre-screen restrictions** screen you will see just how many students actually meet your requirements. If the number is too low, then consider changing your criteria.

What happens is that if a participant has completed the pre-screen survey (and in 2009 100% of students who used SONA did), and selected a particular option on a particular question, then **only** that participant will be able to see and sign up for the study. This is why making the requirements too restrictive is a bad idea.

The advantage is that participants who ignore study requirements (e.g. smokers only), cause less trouble, since they will not even be able to see studies they are not eligible for. The system only fails if a participant gets the questions wrong on the pre-screen, e.g. some students do not even get the male/female question correct and find themselves signing up for all the wrong studies.

Note importantly that the pre-screen tool is best thought of as a **filter** NOT a method of data collection. Pre-screening is, as it says, for pre-screening. No researchers, regardless of their ethics approval will be allowed access to the complete data set for their questionnaire. Researchers will not be able to see the students’ actual responses to any pre-screen questions. This means:

- If you set pre-screen restrictions across a range then you know when a participant arrives that they have met the criteria you set, but you will not have access (then or ever) to their particular score. You will need to have them take the questionnaire again if you require their data.
- If you set a pre-screen restriction to people who answer yes to “Male?”, then you can of course be confident anyone who manages to sign up is a male. However if you need to know in advance which category a student belongs to, create multiple versions of your experiment and make the restrictions complementary. For example make “Body Image Study 1” restricted to males only, and “Body Image Study 2” restricted to females only. Since students will only be able to see one of them, there is no confusion for them, and you will know in advance who has signed up. This technique is also useful for balancing out the size of experimental conditions (e.g. if you need equal numbers of Mandarin and English speakers).
IMPORTANT INFORMATION

1. NEVER RUN A SUBJECT WHO HAS NOT SIGNED UP FOR YOUR EXPERIMENT.

Students can get the room numbers wrong, bully researchers into letting them be tested, or are just so convinced that they pressed the sign-up button they won’t take no for an answer. The best rebuttal is a print-out of your sign-ups taken directly off SONA after your lead time has expired. Know who is coming to your experiment. And stick your list to the door also if you don’t want your session interrupted by wanderers. ‘I think I signed up for this experiment but I’m not sure’ is simply not an excuse anymore with online record keeping. The administration time needed to track down subjects who have been run but never signed up is exorbitant, the ethical risk of running subjects who have not signed their consent is unacceptable, and students can get very angry when they are not credited and even penalized for experiments they should have been at in different locations.

2. TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FILLED SLOTS.

When a student signs up for an experiment, the slot created is the responsibility of the researcher. If the student arrived at the study and made a serious attempt, credit them. If they had to cancel but supplied documentation to justify their absence, select no-show (no-penalty). If they cancelled past the 24 hour point or simply did not turn up, penalize them. Take this action as soon as possible. With the new SONA system slack researchers are effectively penalized because ‘No Action Taken’ slots automatically become ‘Participated’ slots after 48 hours. You can later turn those credits into penalties, but never forget that experiment credits give students course marks so being unreliable or inconsistent or unfair will lead to significant student anxiety.

Also, taking account of slots does not mean selecting “no-show (no penalty)” for any students researchers ‘aren’t sure about’. If students participate, credit them, and if they do not, then penalize them. Only students with a valid excuse or medical certificate should be offered the no-penalty option.

3. INTERNET BASED STUDIES

SONA has an inbuilt online questionnaire tool (which no researcher has used yet), and allows for links to external sites for wholly internet based studies. Since appointment slots for internet based studies experiments do not refer to specific times, be aware that students may sign-up and never feel compelled to complete the study, because without a set time to come and go, they don’t feel they can ever be penalized. All you can set is a “participation deadline”. However it is irresponsible to simply launch a study, place the deadline at the end of semester, and ignore students who sign up in Week 2 yet never seem to make it to the website. For best results, set the participation deadline monthly or even weekly, and at the end of each period penalize those students who have simply done nothing. Students should receive a reminder email 24 hours before the deadline, which might be the only thing which motivates them, so keep the deadlines coming and keep watching the slots. Also keep in mind that the last day of testing each semester is the last day of stuvac.

4. MAKING CHANGES TO STUDIES

If you change the online description the study will be unapproved which means it will be no longer visible (but all other information including filled slots remains). You will then need to request reapproval. Try not to do this that often!

Also, you CANNOT change the credit time awarded once a study is already running and there are sign-ups. At best, you can account for all slots (i.e. make sure every sign-up has been credited or penalized) and request that the pool coordinator change the time for you. Since this change has strange retrospective effects; it is probably best to simply start a new study with a different credit value.
APPENDIX D

**Reviewer’s Report - Empirical Thesis Proposal**

Please comment on strengths and weaknesses. Alert students to potential problems or ambiguities and help them to refine their study, even if you find the research proposal highly satisfactory.

1. The research question appears to be well justified in light of existing literature.
   
   | Yes | No |
   |
   | Yes | No |

   Comment (Has student touched on related issues? Have they considered alternative views?):

   

2. Goals and major hypotheses of the study have been clearly stated.
   
   | Yes | No |
   |
   | Yes | No |

   Comment:

   

3. The following are clearly described and appear to be appropriately selected/defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent and dependent variables</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics and availability of subject pool</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed analyses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics requirements have been observed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Comment:
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Empirical Thesis - Progress Report

This form must be signed by your supervisor and submitted to the Administration Office no later than 1st October 2010.

Student name: ________________________________  Student number: __________________________

Draft thesis title: ________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

I have submitted the following Draft sections to my supervisor:

☐ Introduction  ☐ Method  ☐ Results

Please summarise below any circumstances that have significantly impeded your progress:

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

For completion by supervisor:

I have received this student’s Draft thesis sections as indicated above.

______________________________  __________________________________  ____________
Supervisor name  Supervisor signature  Date
APPENDIX F

EMPIRICAL THESIS SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

Different kinds of research projects place different demands on students at various stages of their execution. Some areas are more technically demanding than others and so it is appropriate for students to receive more assistance from their supervisors in certain aspects of the project. The purpose of this report is to provide a clear idea of the input received from the supervisor and the student’s independence in executing different aspects of the research project.

Provide written comments in response to all questions and rate the student’s level of independence on the following aspects of the empirical thesis.

1. Definition of the research question

Describe the student’s contribution to the choice of research question and the nature and extent of your involvement in this process (e.g. directed student to general area, specified question, helped them derive hypotheses, etc):

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td>About what I would expect of an Honours student</td>
<td>A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Experimental design

Describe the student’s contribution to the experimental design and the nature and extent of your involvement in this process (e.g. fine-tuned the design suggested by the student, suggested major adjustments, provided the design yourself).

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td>About what I would expect of an Honours student</td>
<td>A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Setting up the experiment/s

Describe the student’s contribution to setting up the experiment and the nature and extent of your involvement in this process (e.g. assistance with stimulus selection, programming experiments, designing questionnaires, etc). Please specify if assistance was obtained from someone else (e.g., post-doc or research assistant).

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area:

1. A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student
2. About what I would expect of an Honours student
3. A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student

4. Running the experiment/s

Describe the student’s contribution to running the experiment and the nature and extent of your involvement in this process (e.g. assistance with subject recruitment, testing procedures, participant interviewing, etc). Please specify if assistance was obtained from someone else (post-doc, research assistant, etc).

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area:

1. A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student
2. About what I would expect of an Honours student
3. A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student

5. Data processing and statistical analysis

Describe the student’s contribution to data processing and data analysis and the nature and extent of your involvement in this process (e.g. provided instruction, discussed student’s analysis, specified the analysis, conducted the analysis yourself, etc). Please specify if assistance was obtained from someone else (post-doc, research assistant, etc). If necessary, distinguish between analysis of behavioural data and other types of data (e.g., physiological measures, EEG, fMRI)

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area:

1. A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student
2. About what I would expect of an Honours student
3. A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student
6. Editorial assistance on the thesis

Describe the extent of editorial assistance provided on the thesis (e.g. the number of drafts read, commented extensively/suggested major changes, suggested only minor changes, help with figures, etc).

Rate the student’s level of independence in this area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot less independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td>About what I would expect of an Honours student</td>
<td>A lot more independent than expected of an Honours student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Amount of consultation with the student

a. How often and for how long did you meet with the student on average?
b. Do you consider this amount of consultation satisfactory?

How do you rate the amount of consultation with this student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot less than average</td>
<td>About right</td>
<td>A lot more than average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did the student collect all of his/her own data? YES NO

If the student did NOT collect all of his/her own data, what percentage did he/she collect? …%

Please describe the source and nature of the data, and the nature of the student’s involvement in data collection:

9. Any special circumstances that you consider relevant? (Do not include here any circumstances for which an extension or special consideration has been requested)

What effect do you think your comments should have on the examiner’s mark?

Adjust mark up No change in mark Adjust mark down
APPENDIX G

EMPIRICAL THESIS EXAMINER’S REPORT

Please comment on each of the aspects listed below.

Word length
(within 5% - less than 12,600).

Literature review
(Comprehensive; shows grasp of issues; shows critical ability)

Rationale for and aims of research
(Well described; represents an advancement in knowledge)

Design and method
(Choice of variables; appropriateness of design to test hypotheses; adequacy of controls; sampling; originality and appropriateness of materials and procedures)

Presentation of results and data analysis
(Appropriate and clearly labelled tables and graphs; appropriate statistical analysis with justification of choice if necessary; consideration of power; raw data included)

Discussion
(Findings related to stated aims and hypotheses and to previous literature; projection to future research; theoretical implications; awareness of shortcomings)

Overall presentation
(Conciseness; clarity; sufficiency of detail; referencing)

Overall grade (out of 100)

(a) Pre-supervisor’s report:

(b) Post-supervisor’s report:
THEORETICAL THESIS SUPERVISOR’S REPORT

Please answer the following queries about the supervision received by this student and add comments where you feel this could be helpful. Indicate your answers by marking the scale at the appropriate point.

1. **Amount of consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infrequent Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regular Meetings (once per week for most of year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequent/ Prolonged meetings - more than once/week over semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING (1-5):
Comment:

2. **Extent of supervisor’s role in choice and definition of problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little/No direction in topic selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directed reading &amp; discussed student’s ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Directed student to specific topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING (1-5):
Comment:

3. **Extent of originality of student's contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High level of originality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING (1-5):
Comment:

4. **Extent of editorial assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not read Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read/Commented on 1 full Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read/Commented on more than 2 Drafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING (1-5):
Comment:

5. **Any special circumstances that you consider relevant? (Do not include here any circumstances for which an extension or special consideration has been requested)**
6. Was significant assistance received from anyone else?

7. Any other comments?

8. What effect do you think your report should have on the examiner's assessment of this thesis?
THEORETICAL THESIS EXAMINER’S REPORT

Please indicate the selected option by underlining or circling the text.

1. The student has exceeded the 8000 word limit (excluding abstracts, tables, captions, references and appendices) by more than 5%:
   Yes    No

2. The student’s statement of the issue or question to be addressed is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

3. The student’s statement of the thesis to be argued is:
   Not stated  Stated, but not clearly  Clearly stated

4. The student’s acquaintance with the relevant literature is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

5. The student’s account of the conceptual errors which have been made, and/or the misunderstandings which have arisen, concerning this particular problem is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

6. In developing her/his thesis the student’s demonstrated concern for the requirements of logical validity of argument is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

7. The logical arrangement of the thesis (ie., the degree to which its parts cohere to form a cumulative argument) is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

8. Suggestions which the student makes as to how errors or misunderstandings may be avoided, or problems overcome, are:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

9. The originality displayed in the thesis is:
   Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

10. With respect to clarity, the thesis is generally:
    Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

11. In matters of English usage, succinct expression, spelling, punctuation etc, the thesis is:
    Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good

12. In the care taken with technical detail (such as citation of references, presentation of the Bibliography in the approved form, and so on) the thesis is:
    Very poor  Poor  Adequate  Good  Very Good
Overall grade

(a) Pre-supervisor's report:

/100

(b) Post-supervisor's report:

/100

Please provide reasons for awarding grade X rather than Y or Z. (Your comments will be passed on to the student.)