# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2024 Psychology Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

The subject renewal program has introduced changes for many subjects in 2025, these changes are detailed in the change log at the front of each subject outline. When reviewing the 2024 subject assessment advice, it is important to consider any updates to this subject to ensure the feedback in this document remains accurate.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* ensuring the uploaded tasks are legible all facing up (and the same way); and remove blank pages, student notes, exemplars, and formula pages; to ensure moderators can easily differentiate between student evidence to be moderated and teacher scaffolds
* ensuring the uploaded responses have pages of the same size (i.e. not a mixture of A4 and A3 pages) and in colour so teacher marking, and comments are clear
* labelling page numbers clearly (A3 and A4 sizing of pages are sometimes indistinguishable when a document is scanned in online)
* clearly identifying the work of each individual student in collaborative tasks
* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct
* ensuring learning and assessment plans (LAPs) have been uploaded and identifying any adjustments made by the teacher
* ensuring the PSR matches the performance standards identified on the LAP and on the assessment tasks themselves
* encouraging students to avoid pale and/or hard to read text colours, as well as similar background and text colours that become difficult to differentiate when scanned in online
* ensuring student work has word counts indicated on student samples for the investigations folio tasks
* uploading each student sample for each assessment type in a single accessible file, where possible.

Assessment Type 1: Investigations Folio (30%)

This assessment type requires students to complete:

* at least one psychological investigation that must include deconstruction of a problem and design of a psychological investigation
* one investigation with a focus on science as a human endeavour.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring students adhere to maximum word count (page count for deconstruction)
* ensuring that the four pages of Deconstruction and Design are clearly numbered and submitted to moderation along with the 1500-word report
* emphasising the importance of including detailed justifications for the choices made in the Deconstruction and Design
* assessing KA3 for the science as a human endeavour task, as this is the only performance standard that specifically mentions the interaction between science and society
* assisting students in choosing contemporary topics for the science as a human endeavour tasks
* avoiding tasks that are excessively scaffolded, ensuring that students have the opportunity to show evidence of critical thinking and achieve at the highest levels.

Deconstruct and design

The more successful responses commonly:

* used a predefined research program
* provided evidence to demonstrate initiative in applying constructive and focused approaches
* critically deconstructed their problem, considering a range of possible psychological investigation designs and methods in their deconstruction, and explaining how each will influence the success of their design
* featured a discussion with a detailed analysis of data and evaluation of the design, method, and procedures used as well as a critical analysis and evaluation of strengths, limitations, validity, reliability, improvements, and ethics
* considered how the research topic could be investigated using the different research designs with detailed justifications made throughout
* used the four-page limit effectively, leaving little blank space on the pages.

The less successful responses commonly:

* were confused by explicit features of different design types and applied these incorrectly
* lacked justification of the factors that would impact the success of the investigation
* submitted a deconstruction that did not relate specifically to the area of focus (or was not submitted with the report)
* did not evaluate and justify choices throughout
* were heavily scaffolded in the deconstruct and design
* featured a limited discussion of the different design and data types that could be used
* provided a generic mind map, evaluations and justifications that could apply to other reports.

Investigation report

The more successful responses commonly:

* included discussion on the target population and limitations in the actual sample used, as well as suggested improvements
* appropriately displayed data, including and/or table conventions
* discussed a range of strengths and weaknesses including but not limited to; the sample, data type, design type used, and extraneous variables
* discussed a range of realistic improvements that were appropriate and provided clear explanations about how each improvement would improve the quality of the findings
* included conclusions which were connected to relevant theory or psychological knowledge
* reflected on the researched information and used this information to justify and evaluate the effectiveness their research
* interpreted results accurately and provided a systematic and in-depth discussion of the evidence leading to the formulation of logical and highly relevant conclusions
* discussed research ethics specific to the investigation
* used psychological terms effectively and communicated ideas concisely and clearly
* evaluated reliability and validity thoroughly, including strengths and weaknesses of replicability of the study and valid means of measurement.

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided a recount of what they did
* included raw data or too many graphs and tables in their report, making it difficult to interpret
* used personal language instead of formal scientific language
* gave a generic interpretation of results with no or with little justification of what the results meant for the conclusion of the study
* repeated the same design without real or adequate changes (when using previous research program)
* lacked explicit and relevant psychological terminology
* struggled to provide evidence of IAE3 when assessed
* did not include a method that could be easily followed
* provided control and extraneous variables that were superficial
* confused independent and dependent variables.

Science as a Human Endeavour

Successful students analysed SHE elaborations highly effectively in their response, integrating their psychological knowledge throughout the task, not just in the background psychology section.

The more successful responses commonly:

* used multiple articles to prompt the SHE discussion rather than just one source based on research that was current
* used psychological terms effectively and communicated ideas concisely and clearly
* selected topics that were particularly relevant to current society, could apply psychological concepts to the real world, and featured a detailed discussion of the interaction between science and society (in both directions)
* focused specifically on only one or two of the SHE key concepts in Psychology to allow for more in-depth discussion, as opposed to trying to briefly cover all SHE key concepts, or only briefly covering one
* linked their chosen topic to these SHE concepts authentically with specific examples (e.g. quotes from articles)
* discussed in depth the impact their chosen topic will have on society.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focussed on research that was outdated and not current
* provided answers that reflected historical research and recounts of theories that did not enable students to critically explore and show understanding of the contemporary interaction between science and society
* provided very little reference to the society-society interaction
* demonstrated a poor application of psychological concepts to specific context
* included a word count where the majority was spent on psychological background information
* lacked evidence showing an understanding of the interaction between science and society as a 'feedback loop' — the students were only able to discuss one direction e.g. science interacting with society
* discussed ideas related to SHE but did not link the ideas well, making it hard to determine what SHE key concepts were being discussed
* were severely under the 1500-word limit
* referred to language of SHE key concepts in other sciences, which are different to those in Psychology.

Assessment Type 2: Skills and Applications Tasks (40%)

This assessment type requires students to complete at least three skills and applications tasks which must include at least one task from each of the non-examined topics. At least one skills and applications task should be under the direct supervision of the teacher.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring one of the tasks is under the direct supervision of the teacher (e.g. a test) and clearly identifying that that task has been done under the direct supervision of the teacher
* ensuring each of the three non-examined topics are assessed
* encouraging students to adhere closely to the maximum word count
* ensuring time provided for ‘timed assessment pieces’ fits within the SACE guidelines as stipulated in the subject outline (for example, SASTA trial examinations, mid-year, or trial examinations may be longer than the maximum time limit permitted and should not be used for this assessment type)
* including tasks that provide an appropriate balance of routine and more complex problems that effectively differentiate student psychological knowledge and understanding of concepts across the grade bands
* finding a good balance of ‘traditional’ standalone test style assessments focussed on the technical aspects of the subject mixed with innovative approaches that allow students to develop other capabilities, including video presentations and assessments that build on one another throughout the subject.

The more successful responses commonly:

* were able to identify and explain psychological terminology well and link them to relevant scenarios
* applied psychological concepts and terms effectively to diverse contexts
* showed depth in their understanding because the task design allowed the students to elaborate and present their knowledge in a variety of ways
* benefited from strong task design (e.g. were given choice, but still given clear and explicit direction and instruction from the teacher)
* analysed the researched information rather than simply recounted it
* showed a variety of types of assessments, e.g. an assignments and tests
* allowed students some agency in what they focussed on for the assessment
* included timed tasks that were of a similar style, structure, and standard to the end-of-year examination, e.g. including extended response questions in tests
* included application questions allowing the students to demonstrate their knowledge in new and unfamiliar contexts
* provided evidence for a range of performance standards, providing detailed responses with appropriate use of psychological terminology
* acknowledged information from a wide range of sources appropriately.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only provided evidence in the form of assignments, not a timed task/test. These students were unable to provide evidence (depth of analysis, evaluation, and critical thinking) required for the higher-grade bands
* misunderstood the nature of the question(s) posed in a task and demonstrated a weak understanding of the course content
* included marking rubric only for in-class presentations that were not recorded, meaning there was insufficient evidence to support the grade given
* came from tasks that did not align with the knowledge and skills covered in the current SACE Stage 2 subject outline
* featured tests that were based on the old curriculum and marked according to old standards. Diverse questions are preferable, and students should be rewarded for responses that align with the current curriculum
* responded to sets of tasks that were only made up of tests, limiting student choice and reducing the opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding of selecting sources
* used tests that included exam questions from previous years that can be accessed on the SACE Board website
* provided very brief responses, especially in tests
* provided definitions of the psychological concepts, but could not effectively elaborate or apply these to the scenarios
* included multiple questions on the same concept in a SAT, double penalising some students
* were significantly over or under the word or time limit
* relied too heavily on research tasks, not allowing the students to demonstrate their knowledge of psychology in new and unfamiliar contexts
* used only a few sources of information or cited unreliable sources of information in research assignments.

# External Assessment

Assessment Type 3: Examination

Students undertook a 130-minute online examination, using their understanding of psychology to answer questions that assess their Stage 2 Psychology science inquiry skills; science understanding of Topic 4: Social Influence and of Topic 5: The Psychology of Learning.

Section 1

Question 1 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* included explanations of ethical considerations, naturalistic setting, demand characteristics, external validity, practicality
* gave reasons in the context of the naturalistic setting, practicality or avoiding ethical concerns with manipulating nurses’ shifts.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not link to the scenario (impact of shift work on wellbeing)
* did not understand aspects of observational research design and/or confused with experimental or qualitative designs
* just talked generally about observing nurses in their workplace without answering the question.

Question 1 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* discussed the validity of using the observational design with specific reference and application of internal and/or external validity (both were not required) with reference to the scenario (e.g. small sample, lacking representativeness)
* could identify and explain that some aspects of validity were high, and others low (if they explained this accurately and did not contradict themselves)
* discussed aspects that would lower external validity including the small sample or its representativeness (1 hospital and only nurses)
* explained how different factors identified would increase or decrease validity.

The less successful responses commonly:

* confused validity with reliability
* contradicted themselves by discussing how a factor would both increase and decrease validity
* showed limited understanding of what validity is
* did not actually evaluate validity and say whether the identified factors would increase or decrease it
* spoke very generally about ‘accuracy’ without *evaluating* validity as the question asked.

Question 1 (c)

Note: Many students struggled with this question and were unable to describe the focus group method.

The more successful responses commonly:

* methodically described the focus group process (trained facilitator, open questions, small group of 6-12 participants, etc.) and provided examples relevant to the scenario
* gave example questions that may be discussed within the focus group in the context of the scenario
* explained the use of open-ended questions to provide rich, verbal data.

The less successful responses commonly:

* described design types like the experimental design or the subjective quantitative measure mentioned in the scenario instead
* described other data collection methods like questionnaires or rating scales
* talked about asking nurses individually about their wellbeing
* talked about the Delphi technique
* did not address the question (either missing “using examples” or “the focus group process”)

Question 2

The more successful responses commonly:

* compared how both systematic desensitisation and CBT could be used to treat Nico’s phobia
* clearly indicated and explained which would be more suitable using valid reasons such as systematic desensitisation being more suited for dealing with a learned fear response or the root cause of the maladaptive behaviour
* gave comprehensive descriptions of CBT that included the behaviour therapy component
* referenced both Cognitive Behaviour Therapy *and* Systematic Desensitisation (not necessarily equally), linked to Nico’s phobia of aeroplanes and provided a justification of which would be more effective (either could have been correct)
* discussed the advantages of each intervention, rather than just covering the process.

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked depth for 6 marks
* only described the cognitive therapy component of CBT *or* said that changing cognitions would automatically lead to a change in behaviour. Did not show an understanding that there is a behaviour therapy component
* talked about one of the interventions as being easier or faster
* did not include teaching relaxation strategies as part of their description of systematic desensitisation
* described progressive exposure more generally, without including the establishment of a fear hierarchy first
* provided a rote learnt response of either CBT or Systematic Desensitisation, without providing a justification for which would be more effective

Question 3 (a)(i)

Note: There were some unique aspects of this scenario which are not commonly seen in experimental designs which confused some students (e.g. ethical concerns and external validity concerns were less problematic due to the procedures of this specific investigation).

The more successful responses commonly:

* gave a specific advantage that was relevant to the scenario (e.g. ability to establish a causal relationship)
* explained how/why it was an advantage.

The less successful responses commonly:

* gave general advantages of the experimental design like high control over extraneous variables that doesn’t necessarily apply here due to students sleeping at home
* did not explain how or why it was an advantage
* tried to discuss causation but incorrectly identified the IV and DV
* identified an advantage or feature without *describing* or providing reference to the scenario
* misunderstood experimental design features (confused with observational)

Question 3 (a)(ii)

The more successful responses commonly:

* gave a specific disadvantage that was relevant to the scenario e.g. less control over extraneous variables due to students sleeping at home
* explained how/why it was a disadvantage.

The less successful responses commonly:

* gave general disadvantages of the experimental design that does not necessarily apply here. For example, many students discussed ethical concerns related to manipulating sleep even though students were a) sleeping in their own beds and b) the experimental group were only sleeping 1 for extra hour. Yet students talked about ethical concerns related to sleep deprivation or significantly changing their sleep patterns
* did not explain how or why it was a disadvantage.

Question 3 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* gave specific examples of standard deviation’s provided in the table to explain why class P would be more reliable
* explained what a standard deviation is and how it is a measure of dispersion
* discussed disadvantages such as impact of extraneous variables (e.g. lack of control over variables due to students sleeping in their own homes).

The less successful responses commonly:

* incorrectly identified aspects such as artificial/controlled setting (which were not relevant in this scenario)
* did not discuss or link to scenario
* were able to identify that class P would be more reliable but couldn’t explain why
* talked about differences between the test 1 and 2 mean scores instead of using standard deviation. This often showed that students also don’t understand the mean or how it is impacted by outliers. Students seemed to think that a smaller difference in mean meant that outliers weren’t present, rather than appreciating that outliers could be present in both tests.

Question 3 (c)

Note: This was answered successfully by the majority of students, even those who struggled with parts (a) and (b).

The more successful responses commonly:

* identified that class P was the control group and justified the use of Class P to provide baseline data as a comparison, to evaluate whether the independent variable (sleep duration) did impact the dependent variable (academic performance).

The less successful responses commonly:

* stated Class P was not required
* did not link to scenario or use appropriate terminology (IV/DV).

Question 4

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly defined self-monitoring and referenced high and/or low self-monitors
* provided a scenario (often linked to social media usage) and how this validates self-concept
* gave specific examples of how high and/or low self-monitors may behave in specific contexts. Many students gave good examples linked to social media or peer pressure.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not include a specific example to illustrate their answer
* confused self-monitoring with self-presentation
* talked about monitoring behaviour in general – like how much an individual uses social media
* described behaviour modification.

Question 5 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* named classical conditioning as the type of conditioning that occurred
* identified and described classical conditioning in the context of the scenario, identifying all components using key terminology (UCS, CS, CR, UCR) with reference to Lee
* clearly structured their answer as before > during > after conditioning
* described the process of classical conditioning in terms of the acquisition and performance phase
* explained how the rap song starts off as a neutral stimulus and then becomes the CS.

The less successful responses commonly:

* identified the UCS as simply the “e-scooter” rather than a speeding e-scooter or the near miss
* identified the components of classical conditioning but not describing the process in enough detail
* incorrectly identifying the different components (e.g. the rap song being the UCS and the e-scooter being the NS)
* incorrectly identified operant conditioning as the type of learning
* did not use key terminology or were not specific enough (e.g. UCS needed to be speeding/moving e-scooter).

Question 5 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* named stimulus generalisation as the response
* described stimulus generalisation in the context of the scenario – identifying what the similar stimuli are and what CR is being elicited by these similar stimuli
* explained stimulus generalisation using key terminology, referencing Lee’s learning.

The less successful responses commonly:

* defined stimulus generalisation but not in the context of the scenario
* did not explain what CR is being elicited by the similar stimuli (other rap songs)
* talked about Lee not knowing the difference between different rap songs
* did not use key terminology and/or did not address this aspect of the question (generalised response to the rap song).

Question 5 (c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* explained how Lee’s direct, personal experience would influence his attitude formation and what this attitude would be.

The less successful responses commonly:

* focused on the structure of attitudes (tricomponent model ABC model of attitudes)
* talked about Lee’s experience more generally but didn’t specifically say that it was a direct, personal experience
* contradicted themselves - said Lee’s personal experience was frightening but then said he would form a positive attitude towards the legalisation of e-scooters.

Question 6 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed depth of understanding about one understanding of either *Communication and Collaboration, Development and Application* or *Influence SHE concepts* and selected appropriate information from the source as evidence of this (identified by quotation marks)
* demonstrated original thinking – could explain how the research illustrated the chosen SHE concept, including discussion of the impact on society.

The less successful responses commonly:

* simply quoted or paraphrased the source material
* did not include any psychological terminology related to SHE concepts
* rewrote the stem without adding any additional information
* did not explain the impact on society or how it illustrates the interaction between science and society
* discussed multiple SHE concepts but did not necessarily cover one in enough depth for 4 marks.

Question 6 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* described each component of the biopsychosocial model clearly
* gave specific examples of a biological, psychological, and social factor that were explained in the context of the scenario
* used sub-headings or clearly identified in their opening sentences, which aspect of the BPS model they were referring to before listing their examples
* successful examples of biological factors included: release of endorphins or serotonin, reducing stress by depleting cortisol
* successful examples of psychological factors included: improvement in self-esteem, emotional regulation, personality characteristics, reduction in anxiety or depression
* successful examples of social factors was generally centred on the benefits of being part of a group.

The less successful responses commonly:

* described factors without identifying whether they were a biological, psychological, or social factor
* often psychological factors were incorrect – students often described biological or social factors as psychological factors. E.g. being part of a group, or the release of endorphins from exercise
* discussed age or perceived gender as biological factors – these were not awarded marks
* did not include any psychological terminology
* confused one or more aspects or did not cover all aspects of the model
* rewrote large parts of the question stem.

Question 6 (c)

Note**:** This question was very well-answered by students. It is clear psychological ethics is a concept well understood by students.

The more successful responses commonly:

* students successfully applied confidentiality, informed consent, right to withdraw and potential for harm to the scenario.

The less successful responses commonly:

* applied ethical principles like potential for harm in ways that were not applicable to the scenario
* discussed deception and debriefing
* did not reference the scenario.

Question 7 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* gave a concise and clear definition of normative social influence (changing behaviour in order to be accepted by group) with reference to Daisy
* used specific examples of Daisy’s behaviour from the scenario to support their ideas (e.g. Daisy’s gossiping).

The less successful responses commonly:

* reworded the scenario from the source
* described compliance
* confused normative and informational social influence
* did not refer to the source.

Question 7 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly described compliance and identification and explained how Daisy illustrated both of these types of conformity.

The less successful responses commonly:

* only discussed one of the types of conformity Daisy displayed (compliance or identification)
* talked about Daisy first displaying internalisation and this changing to compliance
* defined the two types of conformity but didn’t apply them to Daisy
* described how Daisy conformed without clearing naming and describing the types of conformity
* did not use psychological terminology.

Question 7 (c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* discussed the incongruence between Daisy’s attitude and behaviour leading to cognitive dissonance (e.g. Attitude = “I’m a caring individual” and behaviour = “engaging in gossip” = cognitive dissonance).

The less successful responses commonly:

* provided very generic answers, devoid of any key terminology
* described the structure of Daisy’s attitude using the ABC model
* described conformity and how this makes Daisy feel guilty.

Question 8 (a)

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated the understanding that the mirror neurons would be firing both when Suki observes her dad play and when she plays
* discussed how mirror neurons help Suki to mimic her dad’s actions by internally representing the observed actions
* described that as Suki watches her dad tidy the room, mirror neurons fire in Suki's brain, facilitating the encoding of the observed behaviour for potential imitation
* many used the wording “monkey see, monkey do” but also elaborated on this.

The less successful responses commonly:

* just said that mirror neurons are involved in observational learning
* described ARRM
* poorly phrased explanations including that it is the mirror neurons that replicate the behaviour or simply stated “monkey see, monkey do” with no further explanation, showing limited understanding
* described operant conditioning
* did not refer to Suki’s learning.

Question 8 (b)

The more successful responses commonly:

* described behaviour modification in the context of Suki, including monitoring behaviour to establish a baseline, goal setting, designing a contingency contract and then gradually removing reinforcement
* gave examples of each of these steps specific to Suki
* described reinforcement as leading to an increase in behaviour

The less successful responses commonly:

* just described positive reinforcement
* described all types of operant conditioning
* described using punishment
* did not include enough steps in the process to achieve all of the content marks
* summarised the process in general, rather than in the context of Suki.

Question 8 (c)

The more successful responses commonly:

* described the correct schedule of reinforcement (variable ratio schedule) in the context of Suki and explained what behaviour is being intermittently reinforced.

The less successful responses commonly:

* described the pattern on the graph, rather than describing the schedule for Suki
* incorrectly identified fixed ratio at the fastest schedule
* incorrectly identified a different schedule and did not describe Variable Ratio as required.

Question 8 (d)

The more successful responses commonly:

* was able to explain that variable schedules are more resistant to extinction due to the reinforcement being unpredictable and thus the learner continuing to perform the behaviour in anticipation of the reward.

The less successful responses commonly:

* just defined extinction
* discussed variable interval due to it having the line with the most gradual slope
* correctly identified a variable schedule but struggled to explain why it would be more resistant to extinction.

Section 2

Question 9

The more successful responses commonly:

* used psychological terminology correctly (e.g. central route and/or peripheral route or Yale model, Direct Experience, Indirect Experience, Mere Exposure) and explained these processes in detail
* linked their suggested improvements specifically using examples relevant to salty Sarah’s Radio scenario
* had well-structured responses (logical flow of ideas, correct terminology, paragraphs, correct spelling/grammar).

The less successful responses commonly:

* described the of central route, peripheral route, Indirect Experience, Mere Exposure or Yale model but with no discussion of improvements
* lacked a logical flow of ideas
* contradicted themselves in their explanations
* used generic examples rather than ones relevant to Salty Sarah’s campaign.

Question 10

The more successful responses commonly:

* showed a clear understanding that the different aspects are linked as part of the same attitude
* explained how stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination are linked
* successfully applied strategies to show how prejudice could be reduced
* used information about Margaret from the source to support their points
* described *how* their suggested strategy would reduce prejudice
* had well-structured responses (logical flow of ideas, correct terminology, paragraphs, correct spelling/grammar).

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not suggest an improvement strategy
* suggested a strategy that would not be relevant or practically applicable to Margaret
* confused stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination
* lacked a logical flow of ideas.

Question 11

Option 1

The more successful responses commonly:

* correctly named and explained attention, retention, reproduction and/or motivation
* applied specific examples from the scenario to illustrate their points
* could clearly distinguish between characteristics of the model vs characteristics of the learner (explaining and applying relevant terms such as status, expertise, relationship, personality, interest, gender etc)
* specifically applied to Ria’s learning and the stem scenario
* had well-structured responses (logical flow of ideas, correct terminology, paragraphs, correct spelling/grammar).

The less successful responses commonly:

* lacked detail in their answer to gain full marks
* confused aspects of the ARRM model
* did not discuss characteristics of the model or learner
* lacked a logical flow of ideas.

Option 2

The more successful responses commonly:

* had an organised structure with a logical flow of ideas
* explained in detail the process of operant conditioning and shaping breaking down the successive steps of the process using examples specific to the scenario (e.g. Step 1: Reward the behaviour of putting on boots, Step 2: Reward the behaviour of crossing laces, Step 3: Reward the behaviour of “bunny ear” laces, Step 4: Reward the behaviour of double knotting laces etc)
* discussed the importance of appropriate rewards/reinforcer and justified the choice of rewards they used
* included explanation of the importance of continuity and contingency
* had well-structured responses (logical flow of ideas, correct terminology, paragraphs, correct spelling/grammar).

The less successful responses commonly:

* gave general rote learned definitions of operant conditioning or shaping, but did not apply to the scenario
* lacked a logical flow of ideas
* did not provide enough detail to earn full marks.