THE INDEPENDENT
INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

MODULE NAME:	MODULE CODE:
INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH	**INRS7311/d/e/f/p/w**
INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH	**INRS7321/d/f/p/w**

ASSESSMENT TYPE: SUMMATIVE PROJECT (PAPER & MARKING RUBRIC)

TOTAL MARK ALLOCATION: 200 MARKS

TOTAL HOURS: A minimum of 20 HOURS is suggested to complete this assessment

By submitting this assignment, you acknowledge that you have read and understood all the rules as per the terms in the registration contract, in particular the assignment and assessment rules in The IIE Assessment Strategy and Policy (IIE009), the intellectual integrity and plagiarism rules in the Intellectual Integrity Policy (IIE023), as well as any rules and regulations published in the student portal.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. ***No material may be copied from original sources, even if referenced correctly, unless it is a direct quote indicated with quotation marks. No more than 10% of the assignment may consist of direct quotes.***
2. ***Make a copy of your assignment before handing it in.***
3. *Assignments must be typed unless otherwise specified.*
4. *All work must be adequately and correctly referenced.*
5. *Begin each section on a new page.*
6. *Follow all instructions on the assignment cover sheet.*
7. *This is an individual assignment.*
8. *The word count for the entire project is between 5000-5500 words. The wordcount is to be stipulated on the cover page of your document. Students should note that the lecturer will not mark beyond the maximum word count (5500 words). This means that students exceeding the word count could substantially lose marks. For example, a student exceeding the 5500-word limit by submitting 6000 words, could find that they lose all marks allocated to the final section of the project if that section falls into the 500 words not marked.*

Referencing Rubric

Providing evidence based on valid and referenced academic sources is a fundamental educational principle and the cornerstone of high-quality academic work. Hence, The IIE considers it essential to develop the referencing skills of our students in our commitment to achieve high academic standards. Part of achieving these high standards is referencing in a way that is consistent, technically correct and congruent. This is not plagiarism, which is handled differently.

Poor quality formatting in your referencing will result in a penalty **of** according to the following guidelines **a maximum of ten percent being deducted from the overall percentage**. Please note, however, that **evidence of plagiarism in the form of copied or uncited work (not referenced), absent reference lists, or exceptionally poor referencing, may result in action being taken in accordance with The IIE's Intellectual Integrity Policy (0023)**.

Markers are required to provide feedback to students by indicating **(circling/underlining) the information that best describes the student's work.**

Minor technical referencing errors: 5% deduction from the overall percentage. – the student's work contains **five or more errors** listed in the minor errors column in the table below.

Major technical referencing errors: 10% deduction from the overall percentage. – the student's work contains **five or more errors** listed in the major errors column in the table below**.**

If both minor and major errors are indicated, **then 10% only** (and not 5% or 15%) is deducted from the overall percentage. The examples provided below are not exhaustive but are provided to illustrate the error.

Required: Technically correct referencing style	Minor errors in technical correctness of referencing style Deduct 5% from overall percentage. Example: if the response receives 70%, deduct 5%. The final mark is 65%.	Major errors in technical correctness of referencing style Deduct 10% from the overall percentage. Example: if the response receives 70%, deduct 10%. The final mark is 60%.
Consistency • The same referencing format has been used for all in-text references and in the bibliography/reference list.	Minor inconsistencies. • The referencing style is generally consistent, but there are one or two changes in the format of in-text referencing and/or in the bibliography. • For example, page numbers for direct quotes (in-text) have been provided for one source, but not in another instance. Two book chapters (bibliography) have been referenced in the bibliography in two different formats.	Major inconsistencies. • Poor and inconsistent referencing style used in-text and/or in the bibliography/ reference list. • Multiple formats for the same type of referencing have been used. • For example, the format for direct quotes (in-text) and/or book chapters (bibliography/ reference list) is different across multiple instances.
Technical correctness • Referencing format is technically correct throughout the submission. • The correct referencing format for the **discipline** has been used, i.e., either **APA,** OR **Harvard** OR **Law** • Position of the reference: a reference is directly associated with every concept or idea. • For example, quotation marks, page numbers, years, etc. are applied correctly, sources in the bibliography/reference list are correctly presented.	**Generally, technically correct with some minor errors.** • The correct referencing format has been consistently used, but there are one or two errors. • Concepts and ideas are typically referenced, but a reference is missing from one small section of the work. • Position of the references: references are only given at the beginning or end of every paragraph. • For example, the student has incorrectly presented direct quotes (in-text) and/or book chapters (bibliography/reference list).	**Technically incorrect.** • The referencing format is incorrect. • Concepts and ideas are typically referenced, but a reference is missing from small sections of the work. • Position of the references: references are only given at the beginning or end of large sections of work. • For example, incorrect author information is provided, no year of publication is provided, quotation marks and/or page numbers for direct quotes missing, page numbers are provided for paraphrased material, the incorrect punctuation is used (in-text); the bibliography/reference list is not in alphabetical order, the incorrect format for a book chapter/journal article is used, information is missing e.g. no place of publication had been provided (bibliography); repeated sources on the reference list.
Congruence between in-text referencing and bibliography/ reference list • All sources are accurately reflected and are all accurately included in the bibliography/ reference list.	**Generally, congruence between the in-text referencing and the bibliography/ reference list with one or two errors.** • There is largely a match between the sources presented in-text and the bibliography. • For example, a source appears in the text, but not in the bibliography/ reference list or vice versa.	**A lack of congruence between the in-text referencing and the bibliography.** • No relationship/several incongruencies between the in-text referencing and the bibliography/reference list. • For example, sources are included in-text, but not in the bibliography and vice versa, a link, rather than the actual reference is provided in the bibliography.
In summary: the recording of references is accurate and complete.	In summary, at least **80%** of the sources are correctly reflected and included in a reference list.	In summary, at least **60%** of the sources are incorrectly reflected and/or not included in reference list.

Summative Project Brief   **(Marks: 200)**

The purpose of this project is to develop your understanding of the processes and techniques of research and develop your ability to assess the validity of research findings through interpretation and critical analysis of previous research. This will be done over the course of three questions.

You will need to break up each of the three pre-selected articles into their various research components in order to identify, compare, analyse, and evaluate the research decisions made. The three pre-selected research articles have been chosen because of their sometimes different (and sometimes similar) approaches to research. You will be required to determine where these similarities and differences lie, and what their consequences are for the various stages in the research process. It is expected that you analyse the research articles by deconstructing the research decisions made by the author(s) using the theory covered throughout the module. Your understanding of the various elements of the research process will be assessed through your ability to provide an academically sound critique of the research articles, substantiated by a range of academic sources.

Various activities on Learn have been created to guide you through the analysis of the three pre-selected research articles. All answers provided will need to be well-argued using more than one source. It is therefore expected that you undertake additional reading in order to appropriately justify any arguments and/or critiques made. You will have to engage with the various paradigms, methodologies, and research expectations for both qualitative and quantitative research as well as the ethical considerations applicable to each. By the end of the semester, you will have applied all the theory you have learned by making sense of why the researchers made the decisions they did, arguing if the decisions were sound, and when asked, providing alternatives. You will need to apply academic literacy skills throughout the project.

Ebscohost permalinks to the three pre-selected research articles follow:

Article 1:

Sinclair, T. 2021. What's in a therapy room? A mixed-methods study exploring clients' and therapists' views and experiences of the physical environment of the therapy room. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research*, 21(1):118-129. [Online]. Available at:

https://ezproxy.iielearn.ac.za/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=148865485&site=ehost-live&scope=site [Accessed 27 January 2023].

Article 2:

Chan, K. 2021. Children's perception of YouTube videos with product endorsements: An exploratory study. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 11(1): 105-121. [Online]. Available at:

https://ezproxy.iielearn.ac.za/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=150660160&site=ehost-live&scope=site [Accessed 27 January 2023].

Article 3:

Damerji, H. and Salimi, A. 2021. Mediating effect of user perceptions on technology readiness and adoption of artificial intelligence in accounting. *Accounting Education*, 0(2), 107–130. [Online]. Available at:

https://ezproxy.iielearn.ac.za/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=149454110&site=ehost-live&scope=site [Accessed 27 January 2023].

The word count for the entire project is between 4500-5500 words. The word count is to be stipulated on the cover page of your document. Students should note that the lecturer will not mark beyond the maximum word count (5500 words). This means that students exceeding the word count could substantially lose marks. For example, a student exceeding the 5500-word limit by submitting 6000 words, could find that they lose all marks allocated to the final section of the project if that section falls into the 500 words not marked.

Question 1			**(Marks: 85)**
Write a report in which you analyse EACH of the pre-selected research articles to **identify** and **discuss** the research paradigm and design the authors followed, and then explain how this informed the decisions made by the researchers. And then, applying **critical thinking skills**, you will need to consider **alternate** research methods, and motivate your choices using **sources** beyond your textbook.			
Q.1.1	Identify the paradigm/tradition for each article. You will need to motivate each choice of paradigm using examples from each of the articles as well as a critical discussion of each of the paradigms chosen.		(10)
Q.1.2	Identify the following elements of the research design for each article. You will need to motivate using examples from each article, as well as theory from various sources.		
	Q.1.2.1	Research methodology.	(10)
	Q.1.2.2	Type of research.	(10)
Q.1.3	Identify the population and sampling types and methods used in each article.		
	Q.1.3.1	Using examples from each article, as well as theory from the prescribed text, describe the population and sampling methods used in each study. Each answer should outline the target and accessible population, population parameters, unit of analysis and sampling method.	(15)
	Q.1.3.2	For each article, using appropriate theory, argue in favour of an alternate sampling method, that aligns with the same paradigm/tradition and research question.	(10)
Q.1.4	Identify the data collection methods used in each article.		
	Q.1.4.1	Using examples from each article, identify the data collection methods used in each study. Motivate your answer with examples from each article as well as theory from various sources.	(10)
	Q.1.4.2	For each article, using appropriate theory, argue in favour of an alternate data collection method that aligns with the same paradigm/tradition and research question.	(10)

| Q.1.5 | Identify and describe the data analysis method in each article. Each answer should be a combination of examples from the articles as well as theory from various sources. | (10) |

Question 2 **(Marks: 85)**

Demonstrate your understanding of paradigms, methodologies and research practicalities by considering the **impact** on each study were the authors are to use an alternate paradigm to that represented in the original articles. You will need to select a **different alternate paradigm** for each research article, so there are **no duplicate** paradigms in your three chosen alternatives.

Q.2.1	For EACH research project, select an alternate paradigm. For each alternate, consider the implications of this change in paradigm on the nature of the research and construct new, alternate versions of the following (for each article):	
	Q.2.1.1	The research problem;	(20)
	Q.2.1.2	The research question/s;	(10)
	Q.2.1.3	Formulate hypotheses and/or objectives based on the alternate paradigm selected;	(10)
	Q.2.1.4	The data collection method (including a clear explanation of and motivation for, choosing that data collection method);	(25)
	Q.2.1.5	The data analysis method (including a clear explanation of, and motivation for, choosing that data analysis method).	(20)

Question 3 **(Marks: 30)**

The overall purpose of research is to add to the body of knowledge using an ethical and systematic process. For each article:

| Q.3.1 | Discuss how the researchers would have ensured trustworthiness and/or reliability and validity when conducting the research. Your answer can be a combination of examples from the articles and theory from various sources. | (15) |
| Q.3.2 | Critically discuss the ethical issues the researchers can be expected to have considered before, during, and after the research process. | (15) |

Appendix A: Marking Rubric

MODULE NAME:			MODULE CODE:
INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH			**INRS7311; INRS7311d; INRS7311e; INRS7311f; INRS7311p; INRS7311w**
INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH			**INRS7321; INRS7321d; INRS7321f; INRS7321p; INRS7321w**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 1.1 The paradigm/ tradition	• The paradigms for two or more of the articles incorrectly identified. • Discussion of the paradigms indicates a lack of understanding of paradigms and their purpose within research. • No evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The paradigms for two or more of the articles correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided but critical discussion thereof is lacking or is unclear. • Some evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The correct paradigm has been identified for each article. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each paradigm. • Evidence of further research beyond textbook.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 1.2.1 Research methodology	• The methodologies for two or more of the articles incorrectly identified. • Motivation for the selection does not provide evidence from the article nor does it link to the paradigm selected in Q.1.1. Rote repetition/explanation of each methodology with no evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The methodologies for two or more of the articles correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article links to the paradigm selected in Q.1.1. however critical discussion thereof is lacking or is unclear. • Some evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The correct research methodology has been identified for each article. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each methodology with links to the paradigm selected in Q.1.1. • Evidence of further research beyond textbook.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 1.2.2 Type of research	• The type of research for two or more of the articles incorrectly identified. • No evidence from the article used in motivation for the selection. • Rote repetition/explanation of each type of research with no evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The type of research for two or more of the articles correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Critical discussion of each type of research is lacking or unclear. • Some evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• The correct type of research has been identified for each article. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each type of research. • Evidence of further research beyond textbook.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 1.3.1 Population and sampling methods used in the study	• Understanding of the difference between target and accessible population lacking. For two or more articles the population and unit of analysis was not correctly identified. There has been no or poor attempt to identify population parameters for each article. • Probability or non-probability sampling have not been compared. • There is an attempt to identify and discuss the sampling method in each research article. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article has not been provided. Answer is a rote repetition of facts as opposed to the application of theory to the articles.	• Target and accessible population are discussed demonstrating some understanding of the difference. • For two or more articles the population and unit of analysis have been correctly identified. The identification of population parameters for each article is evident although not always accurate to that research article. • Probability or non-probability sampling have been compared and the choice that should have been made for each article based on their methodology has been somewhat motivated. • There is an attempt to identify and critically discuss the sampling method in each research article. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Answer is not poor rote repetition but rather a combination of theory and examples.	• Target and accessible population are discussed demonstrating an understanding of the difference. • For each article, the population and unit of analysis has been identified. • The population parameters for each article have been correctly identified. • Probability or non-probability sampling have been compared and the choice that should have been made for each article based on their methodology has been correctly motivated. • The sampling method in each research article was identified and critically discussed. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Answer is not poor rote repetition but rather a combination of theory and examples.	
	0-7	**8-11**	**12-15**	**/15**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 1.3.2 Alternate sampling method each could have used, within the same paradigm/tradition	• The alternate sampling methods possible for two or more research articles have been incorrectly linked to the methodology. Motivation for the specific alternate sampling method selected is evident but poorly argued. • Critical discussion of each alternate sampling method selected lacking. • Mostly a rote repetition of theory.	• The alternate sampling methods possible for two or more research articles have been discussed and correctly linked to the methodology. • Motivation for the specific alternate sampling method selected has been argued logically. Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each alternate sampling method selected. • Not just a rote repetition of theory.	• The alternate sampling methods possible for each research article have been discussed and correctly linked to the methodology. • Motivation for the specific alternate sampling method selected has been argued logically. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each alternate sampling method selected. Theory applied to articles clearly and not just a rote repetition of theory.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 1.4.1 The data collection method/s used	• For two or more of the research articles, the specific data collection method has been incorrectly identified. • Motivation for the selection lacks evidence from the article. • No critical discussion evident.	• For two or more of the research articles, the specific data collection method has been correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Critical discussion of each method is evident but poorly structured.	• For each research article, the specific data collection method has been identified. Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each method.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 1.4.2 Alternate data collection method each could have been used, within the same paradigm/tradition	• The alternate data collection methods possible for two or more of the research articles have been discussed but the implications of the alternate methods are missing or inaccurate. • Motivation for the alternate data collection method has been poorly argued. • No critical discussion evident.	• The alternate data collection methods possible for two of the research articles have been discussed but the implications of the alternate method not always accurate. Motivation for the alternate data collection method has been argued logically. • Critical discussion of each alternate sampling • method selected evident but poorly structured.	• The alternate data collection methods possible for each research article have been discussed and the implications of the alternate method stipulated. • Motivation for the alternate data collection method has been argued logically. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each alternate sampling method selected.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 1.5 Data analysis methods	• For two or more of the research articles, the specific data analysis method has been incorrectly identified. • Motivation for the selection lacks evidence from the article. • No critical discussion of each method.	• For two or more of the research articles, the specific data analysis method has been correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Critical discussion of each method evident but poorly structured.	• For each research article, the specific data analysis method has been correctly identified. • Motivation for the selection with evidence from the article is provided. • Sufficiently clear critical discussion of each method.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 2.1.1 The research problem	• The student duplicated the alternate paradigm selected for more than 1 article, or did not change from the original. • A suitable revised research problem is presented for no more than one of the research articles. • The problem statement does not reflect the selected alternate paradigm and methodology. • The purpose of the research is not identifiable. • The research problem considers none to only a few of the criteria for a suitable research problem.	• Three different paradigms were presented. • A suitable revised research problem is presented for two or more of the research articles. • There is an attempt to reflect the selected alternate paradigm and methodology. • The purpose of the research is identifiable. • The research problem considers most of criteria for a suitable research problem.	• A suitable revised research problem is presented for all three research articles. The new problem statement accurately reflects the selected alternate paradigm and methodology. • The purpose of the research is clearly identifiable. • The criteria for a suitable research problem are implicit in the problem construction.	
	0-9	**10-14**	**15-20**	**/20**
Question 2.1.2 The research question/s	• There is no consideration of the alternate paradigm evident in the newly specified research questions for no more than one of the research articles. • The questions are not articulated clearly or are not congruent with the research problem and purpose formulated n Q2.1.1.	• Consideration of the alternate paradigm is evident in the newly specified research questions for at least two of the research articles. • The questions are articulated clearly and but are not fully congruent with the research problem and purpose formulated n Q2.1.1.	• Consideration of the alternate paradigm is evident in the newly specified research questions for each research article. • The questions are articulated clearly and are congruent with the research problem and purpose formulated in Q2.1.1.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 2.1.3 Formulate hypotheses and/or objectives based on the alternate paradigm selected	• The hypotheses and objectives formulated are not accurate for the paradigm selected previously. • The objectives and hypotheses are misaligned with the new research problem and question/s. • The objectives and hypotheses have not been written using appropriate language. The hypotheses are either missing the alternate or null hypotheses.	• The hypotheses and objectives have been formulated for the correct paradigm selected previously for at least two of the articles. The objectives and hypotheses formulated are aligned with the research problem and question/s. • The objectives and hypotheses have been written but language used not entirely accurate. • The hypotheses are presented as alternate and null hypotheses.	• The hypotheses and objectives have been formulated for the correct paradigm selected previously as an alternate for each research article. • The objectives and hypotheses are formulated in line with the research problem in Q. 2.1.1. • The objectives and hypotheses have been written using appropriate language. The hypotheses are presented as alternate and null hypotheses.	
	0-4	**5-7**	**8-10**	**/10**
Question 2.1.4 The data collection method	• The data collection method selected for no more than one of the research articles is accurately based on the alternate paradigm selected. • Discussion of the selected method is lacking and poorly evidenced by additional sources beyond the textbook. • The implications of this choice on the study are not discussed.	• The data collection method selected for two of the research articles is accurately based on the alternate paradigm selected. • Discussion of the selected method lacks critical analysis or evidenced of additional sources beyond the textbook. • The implications of this choice on the study are discussed but may lack depth.	• The data collection method selected for each research article is based on the alternate paradigm selected. • Critical discussion of the selected method is based on additional sources beyond the textbook. • The implications of this choice on the study are critically discussed.	
	0-11	**12-18**	**19-25**	**/25**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 2.1.5 The data analysis method	• The data analysis method selected for no more than one of the research articles is based on the alternate paradigm selected. The selected methods do not align with the collection methods and research problem previously discussed. • The implications of the choices on the study are discussed but lack depth. • Specifics are not provided as to how the choice would affect presentation and discussion of the results. • The analysis method is not linked to the objectives and/or hypotheses in Q.2.1.3.	• The data analysis method selected for two of the research articles is based on the alternate paradigm selected. • The selected method aligns with the collection method and research problem mentioned previously. • An understanding of the implications of this choice is evident but not articulated well. Specifics are not always provided for how the choice would affect presentation and discussion of the results. • The analysis method is linked to the objectives and/or hypotheses in Q.2.1.3.	• The data analysis method selected for each research article is based on the alternate paradigm selected. • The selected method Is in line with the collection method and research aims. The implications of this choice are critically discussed. • Specifics are provided for how the choice would affect presentation and discussion of the results. • The analysis method is linked to the objectives and/or hypotheses in Q.2.1.3.	
	0-9	**10-14**	**15-20**	**/20**
Question 3.1 Trustworth-iness and/or reliability and validity	• Trustworthiness and/or reliability and validity are explained but limited to rote repetition of the textbook, demonstrating little understanding of the difference and an inability to align with the appropriate methodology. • The attempt to identify the types of validity/reliability/trustworthiness the articles' authors considered or could have considered are incorrect. • Little to no evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• Trustworthiness and/or reliability and validity are discussed demonstrating an understanding of the difference but there may be some misalignment with at least one of the articles to the appropriate methodology. • There is an attempt to identify the types of validity/ reliability/ trustworthiness the articles' authors considered or could have considered. • Some evidence of further research beyond textbook.	• Trustworthiness and/or reliability and validity are discussed demonstrating an understanding of the difference with reference to the appropriate methodology. There is an attempt to identify the types of validity/reliability/trustworthiness the articles' authors considered or could have considered. • Evidence of further research beyond textbook.	
	0-7	**8-11**	**12-15**	**/15**

Criterion	Does not meet expectations/requirements	Meets expectations/requirements	Exceeds expectations/requirements	Mark
Question 3.2 Ethical issues	• Discussion of the role of ethics in research demonstrates little to no understanding of the issues that should have been considered at all stages of the research. Little to no considerations for the participants that have been identified. Little to no discussion or understanding of the ethical issues the researchers should have considered in their own conduct. • Lacks application to the articles.	• The discussion of the role of ethics in research demonstrates some understanding of the issues that should have been considered at all stages of the research. Some, not all, considerations for the participants have been identified. • Some of the ethical issues the researchers should have considered in their own conduct have been analysed.	• Sufficiently clear critical discussion of the role of ethics in research demonstrating an understanding of the issues that should have been considered by the authors at all stages of the research. • Considerations for the participants have been identified. • Ethical issues the researchers should have considered in their own conduct have been analysed.	
	0-7	**8-11**	**12-15**	**/15**

TOTAL			**/200**
PERCENTAGE			**%**
SUBTRACTIONS	See referencing rubric: negative marking applies		- **%**
	TOTAL SUBSTRUCTIONS:		- **%**
FINAL MARK			**%**

END OF PAPER