**PSYC20039**

**Interdisciplinary and Cross-cultural Approaches to Wellbeing**

Assessment Guide

Term 1, 2021

## Assessment Information

**Overview of Unit Assessment**

The aim of the assessments is to deepen our knowledge of diverse ways of thinking about wellbeing and the practices by which we live ‘the good life’ according to what we think wellbeing is all about.

You can see how the assessments link to this broad aim and to the unit content in these summaries:

* **Assessment 1:** What are my own cultural influences? What are the strengths (positive characteristics) and limits to my knowledge that have been fostered by these cultural experiences? What are other people’s cultural influences? What strengths and limitations have these created? How can I apply these insights to positive psychology?
* **Assessment 2:** How do different spiritual/religious traditions explain wellbeing? What practices do they recommend we do to achieve ‘a good life’? How is this different from/the same as my own spiritual/religious perspective on wellbeing?
* **Assessment 3:** What do theorists from different academic disciplines think about wellbeing? What’s the research support for their theories? Can we bring their different ideas together to develop an holistic model of wellbeing?

In the following sections you will find detailed information and marking/feedback sheets for the three assessments for this unit:

##### Assessment 1: Written Assessment (30%)

* **Assessment 2: Practical Assessment (35%)**
* **Assessment 3: Creative work (35%)**

### **Assessment 1: Written Assessment (30%)**

**Assessment 1 due:** 19 April 2021 5pm AEST

**Return date of marked assessments:** 3 May 2021 5pm AEST

Assessment 1 is designed to facilitate understanding of the role of culture in our life circumstances. Adding a positive psychology perspective, we include an investigation of how culture influences the development, cultivation and interpretation of positive characteristics (strengths).

Your task has two (2) parts:

1. **Self-Assessment and discussion using the ADDRESSING framework**:
   1. Choose three (3) criteria in the ADDRESSING framework and complete the Self-Assessment table for these sections\* (provided on Moodle).
   2. Discuss your self-assessment with your partner. (Your partner will be another student in this unit. The Unit Coordinator will assign these pairs in the first week of the unit).

With your partner, discuss:

* + 1. What cultural influences were most important/relevant for them?
    2. How have these shaped their life experiences and how they see themselves?
    3. Where are these life experiences limiting e.g. in relation to social connections?
    4. What positive characteristics have arisen from these cultural influences?

1. **Comparative analysis and reflection:** Provide a 1000-word (+/-10%) comparative analysis and reflection on:
   1. A brief summary of the strengths and limitations your partner identified and the cultural influences on these
   2. Differences and similarities between you
   3. Explore:
      * The thoughts/feelings/issues that arose from the self-assessment and discussion, i.e. gaps in your knowledge where you may need to do more upskilling
      * How your thinking about strengths and culture changed through the self-assessment and discussion
      * How would you apply your new knowledge about the complexity of cultural identities, particularly strengths, to working with clients in a positive psychology role (e.g. as an educator, coach, group facilitator, manager, researcher)

\*You can complete the whole table for your own interest, it’s a really useful and informative exercise, especially if you are working with people already or hope to do so in future. But you only need to submit 3 criteria for the self-assessment. And you only need to discuss these 3 in your conversation with your unit partner.

You will submit:

* Your self-assessment (3 criteria only)
* The comparative analysis

You need to obtain a minimum grade of 50% for this assessment in order to pass the Unit.

**Word count**

There is no word limit for the self-assessment. Please use the example provided on Moodle and in the reading on completing this table as a guide for the amount of information to include. I would expect that the table would not exceed 3 pages.

The maximum word count for the comparative analysis is 1,000 words (+/- 10%). This word limit includes in-text citations but excludes any reference section. Meeting the word count is included as a part of the marking criteria in your marking rubric on Moodle. See the Psychology Word Count Information document on Moodle for a rationale for using this type of word limit restriction

The marking rubric below outlines how the tasks and submissions are graded.

**PSYC20039 – Interdisciplinary & Cross-cultural Approaches to Wellbeing**

**Marking Rubric for Assessment 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **High Distinction** | **Distinction** | **Credit** | **Pass** | **Fail** |
| **Self-assessment (using the ADDRESSING table)**  **12.5 marks** | Overall: The reflection demonstrates the ability of the student to creatively and accurately identify their cultural context; to question their own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions and assumptions; and to accurately and comprehensively apply these insights to the impact of these on their life circumstances. The student defines new modes of thinking as a result.  Includes:   * Creative and insightful exploration of cultural contexts. * Accurate application of concepts of privilege to beliefs and life circumstances. * An honest reflection on limitations to knowledge, connections and empathy. * Thoughtful identification of positive traits which demonstrates an understanding of strengths (i.e. as internal qualities which motivate and energise). * Clear connections between cultural context, limitations and strengths. | Overall: The reflection demonstrates the ability of the student to accurately identify their cultural context; to question their own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions and assumptions; and to apply these insights to their life circumstances.  Includes:   * Accurately explores cultural contexts. * Accurate application of concepts of privilege to beliefs and life circumstances. * An honest reflection on limitations to knowledge, connections and empathy. * Thoughtful identification of positive traits which demonstrates an understanding of strengths. * Generally clear connections between cultural context, limitations and strengths. | Overall: There is a good attempt at self-reflection, but in several minor or a major way demonstrates a more limited awareness of personal biases, stereotypes and preconceptions and/or a minor limitation in identifying and/or understanding strengths.  Includes:   * Explores cultural contexts with some minor errors e.g. does not consider an aspect such as class in Socioeconomic or generation in Age. * Mostly accurate application of privilege. * Identified limitations to knowledge, connections and empathy, but a time when this is application is limited e.g. does not consider the impact of privilege on social connections * May be several minor unclear connections between the life experience and the impact on life circumstances. * Identified positive traits with some minor or a major omission e.g. strength is focused on a physical or material attribute rather than an internal quality. | Overall: Exploration is limited in depth. A superficial coverage of influences and impacts which does not move beyond a limited application of these in exploring limitations and strengths.  Includes:   * Basic but limited, with more than one major gap, of insight into your own cultural influences. * Attempts to demonstrate and apply concepts of privilege but does not always accurately assign these categories. * Application to life circumstances is basic. * Positive traits identified but with a number of inaccuracies demonstrating lack of understanding of this concept. | Overall: The work does not meet the minimum standard required for a self-reflection. No work submitted/no response/irrelevant response  Includes:   * Does not address the task e.g. does not include table or is missing significant parts of the table. * Inaccurate, unreasonable or illegible discussion of own cultural contexts. * Identification of privilege and impacts on life circumstances are mostly inaccurate or missing. * Strengths are inaccurate or missing. * Language is unclear and confusing throughout. Concepts are either not discussed or are presented inaccurately such that the reader cannot understand what is being articulated. |
| **Comparative Analysis and reflection**  **12.5 marks** | Overall: Presents a creative, innovative, very clear and comprehensive analysis of your partner’s views and your own leading to observed changes in knowledge and insightful application to future work.  This includes:   * Thorough analysis and meaning making. * Explains and critiques assumptions, values and beliefs. * Recognition, exploration, attention to emotions, and gained emotional insight. * Demonstrates personal change in terms of thoughts and emotions from your new understanding of strengths and culture. * Thorough, honest reflection on gaps in knowledge, including considerations of privilege. * Feasible and practical application of insights to future/current work in the positive psychology field which include concrete detail e.g. a specific example of how it will be applied | Overall: Presents a very clear and comprehensive comparative analysis between your partner’s views and your own with an exploration of changes in knowledge and applies insights to future work.  This includes:   * Moves beyond description to analysis and meaning making. * Identifies assumptions, values and beliefs. * Recognition, explanation and attention to emotions. * Demonstrates awareness of thoughts and emotions and moves beyond description to identify changes. * Reflection on gaps in knowledge and makes connections with privilege. * Feasible and practical application of insights to future/current work in the positive psychology field e.g. a specific example of how it will be applied but perhaps without relevant concrete details | Overall: Elaborated descriptive writing and impressions but without reflection.  This includes:   * Some analysis and meaning making * Recognition of but limited exploration of or attention to emotions * A reflection on gaps in knowledge, but which could be improved e.g. through greater understanding of privilege and its impacts * Emerging connections made between insights and how this may influence future/current work in the positive psychology field, but with some minor or a major gap e.g. the application was somewhat vague or inarticulate e.g. ‘I will apply to my role as a teacher’ and without detail on how this will be applied. | Overall: Superficial descriptive writing approach (fact reporting, vague impressions) without reflection or introspection.  This includes:   * Little or unclear analysis or meaning making * Minor recognition or attention to emotions * Minimal exploration of personal change demonstrating minimal engagement with thoughts and emotions and connections with partner. * The reflection on gaps in knowledge is superficial and requires improvement in connecting life experiences to limitations. * Basic, superficial connections made between insights and future work e.g. ‘I will apply this to my future work’. | Overall: The work does not meet the minimum standard of basic description. Lacks clear description, no clear comparison or irrelevant comparison, no clear demonstration of reflection.  Includes:   * Description of the partner absent. * No comparative analysis. * Many errors, gaps, or misunderstandings and/or considerable improvement needed in a most of the following aspects: clarity, accuracy, breadth/depth, relevance * Little clear connection between self-assessment and discussion with partner * No work submitted/no response/ irrelevant response. |
| **Overall comprehension, clarity and quality of your submission.**  3 marks | Purposeful, very well integrated, and succinct writing, which clearly conveys key points and insights, and flows logically. Writing is to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Largely purposeful, integrated, and succinct writing, which mostly clearly conveys key points and insights. Writing is mostly to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and mostly persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Writing occasionally lacks focus, integration, clarity and/or succinctness, and/or there may be errors or instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable. The errors occasionally affect comprehension and readability. | There are a number of errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures the meaning and readability some of the time. | There are many errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures meaning and readability most of the time. |
| **Word limit**  2 marks | Word limit met | Over or under word limit by 10 words | Over or under word limit by 25 words | Over or under word limit by 50 words | More than 50 words over or under the word limit |

**Assessment 2: Presentation (35%)**

**Assessment 2 due**: Monday 17 May 2021 5pm AEST

**Return date for marked assessments:** Monday 31 May 2021 5pm AEST

This assessment explores spirituality, religion and wellbeing.

Your task:

For this assessment you will develop a short (minimum 9, maximum 10 minute) audio-visual presentation on how a religion/spiritual tradition of your choice conceptualises and practices wellbeing.

Your audio-visual will include:

1. An initial slide/audio identifying the religion/spiritual tradition you are exploring and briefly outlining the main aspects of this tradition (e.g. its origins, where it is practised and how widespread it is, whether it represents a particular sect/interpretation)
2. An outline of how this religion/spiritual tradition define(s) (there may be more than one definition) wellbeing/’a good life’ (this will draw on reputable sources i.e. not Wikipedia or websites but spiritual texts, published interpretations, and academic writing)
3. An outline of what beliefs and practices this religion/spiritual tradition sees as integral to wellbeing (this will draw on reputable sources i.e. not Wikipedia or websites but spiritual texts, published interpretations, and academic writing)
4. A brief analysis of which definitions, beliefs and practices of this religion/spiritual approach have been found in the research to be related to wellbeing (you may not find research on ‘Buddhist prayer’ or ‘Christian tithing’ and wellbeing, but you will find research on the general practices of prayer and giving for example)
5. A discussion of how this approach is similar to and/or different from your own spiritual/religious understanding of wellbeing
6. A slide with a list of references

**You must use APA style for referencing**, and provide correct in-text citations, on your slides as well as a complete reference list of those citations on your final slide.

In your presentation, you are welcome to use creative ways to present your findings – animation, images, music. You might also simply use PowerPoint which includes audio. This doesn’t have to be an epic masterpiece of filming. If you use photos to support your findings visually they must be source cited if not your own.

**LENGTH:**Your short film will be a minimum of 9 and a maximum of 10 minutes in length

**SUBMISSION DETAILS:**Please submit either your narrated/animated PowerPoint video directly into Moodle or submit a word document which includes the link to your film if you’ve uploaded it onto YouTube.

Moodle accepts files up to 100MB. If your file is larger than this, you will need to use the YouTube option. Please ensure you create the YouTube video as ‘unlisted’ rather than ‘private’.

*You need to obtain a minimum grade of 50% for this assessment in order to pass the Unit.*
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**Marking Rubric for Assessment 2**

| **Criteria** | **HD** | **D** | **C** | **P** | **F** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **An outline of the theory, beliefs and practices for achieving wellbeing in this religion/spiritual tradition.**  **5 marks** | The outline is of a very high standard, well considered and accurate.  Excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books where available. | The outline is of a high standard, well considered and accurate.  Good to excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books where available. | The outline is of a fair standard, well considered and accurate.  Reasonable quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books where available. | The outline is of a basic standard. Some inaccuracies.  Mixed quality of resources. | The outline of beliefs and practices is inaccurate.  Suitable resources have not been drawn upon. |
| **Summarising the research support for the spiritual/religious thinking and practices and their relationship with wellbeing**  **10 marks** | The summary is of a very high standard. The links made between the beliefs, practices and research are accurate and demonstrate an excellent comprehension of the research evidence.  Excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books | The summary is of a high standard. The links made between the beliefs, practices and research are accurate and demonstrate a very good comprehension of the research evidence.  Very good to excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books | The summary is of a good standard. The links made between the beliefs, practices and research are mostly accurate and demonstrate a good comprehension of the research evidence.  Good quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books | The summary is of a basic standard. The links made between the beliefs, practices and research are mostly accurate and demonstrate a beginning comprehension of the research evidence.  Quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books is mixed | The summary does not meet the minimum standards. The links made between the beliefs, practices and research are inaccurate and demonstrate limited comprehension of the research evidence.  Quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books does not meet academic standards or not included |
| **Evidence of critical thinking in the comparison of one’s own spiritual/religious beliefs and those of religion/spiritual tradition considered in the presentation.**  **10 marks** | A very high level of critical thinking in the comparison.  Demonstrates excellent self-insight to identify similarities and differences between one’s own and other’s points of view. | A high level of critical thinking in the comparison.  Demonstrates very good self-insight to identify similarities and differences between one’s own and other’s points of view. | A moderate level of critical thinking in the comparison.  Demonstrates moderate self-insight to identify similarities and differences between one’s own and other’s points of view. | A basic level of critical thinking in the comparison.  Demonstrates some self-insight to identify similarities and differences between one’s own and other’s points of view. | Limited critical thinking in the comparison.  Demonstrates limited self-insight to identify similarities and differences between one’s own and other’s points of view. |
| **The overall quality of the short film and creative thinking utilised to present the program**  **5 marks** | A very high-quality presentation and excellent use of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A high-quality presentation and very good use of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A moderate-quality presentation and evidence of good creative thinking in the design and creation. | A basic-quality presentation Some evidence of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A poor-quality presentation and limited evidence of creative thinking in the design and creation. |
| **Accuracy of, and adherence to, current APA style referencing.**  **Time limit met.**  **5 marks** | Referencing (in-text citations and Reference list) conforms to current APA style. HD performance is error free.  Time limit met. | Referencing (in-text citations and Reference list) largely conforms to current APA style. There are some minor errors.  Time over or under by 10 seconds. | Referencing (in-text citations and Reference list) is somewhat recognisable as current APA style.  Time over or under by 25 seconds. | Referencing (in-text citations and Reference list) is consistently incorrect and/or not APA style.  Time over or under by 50 seconds. | No, or very poor, referencing (in-text citations and Reference list).  Time over or under by over 1 minute. |

**Assessment 3: Creative work (35%)**

**Assessment due date:** Monday 7 June 2021 5pm AEST

**Return date for marked assessments:** Monday 21 June 2021 5pm AEST

This assessment brings together perspectives on wellbeing from different academic disciplines to develop a holistic view of wellbeing.

There are two (2) options for completing this assessment. Please choose one (1) of the following options.

Option 1

1. Create a mind map of wellbeing incorporating 2 (two) theories of wellbeing from different perspectives
2. Use this map to develop a written critical reflection (750 words +/- 10%) of the similarities and differences between the theories, and the research support for each.

Option 2

Write a 1,500 word (+/- 10%) critical reflection on the similarities and differences between two theories of wellbeing, their associated practices (e.g. tithing, prayer, fasting) and the research support for the relationship between these practices and wellbeing.

Some theories covered in this unit that you could compare include:

1. Aristotle and Bentham
2. Epicurean and Stoic
3. PERMA and existential positive psychology
4. Subjective well-being (SWB) and objective wellbeing (specifically, Nussbaum’s capability theory of wellbeing)
5. Kwon’s theory of wellbeing in LGB communities and Deci and Ryan’s self-determination theory
6. Aboriginal perspectives and Western perspectives (e.g. Subjective Well-being or PERMA)

*The mind map*

For each theory, identify the practices (e.g. engaging with the community, exercise, spending money on others) that each deems is essential for wellbeing.

Your mind map should include:

1. Your central concept, which is wellbeing
2. 2 main branches each representing a theory
3. Child branches for each of the main branches showing the practices of wellbeing identified by that theory

The mind map should help you organize not only the theories but also the associated wellbeing practices each suggests. The aim is to gain a perspective on wellbeing that highlights the different ways it is conceptualized and practiced.

An example mind map is available on Moodle, as well as a link to a good article on mind mapping which includes online tools if you would like to use these.

**Presentation of the mind map:** You can draw by hand or use a computer program to design your mind map.

**Layout:** Keep it as simple or complex as you like, just bear in mind that I will need to be able to identify the key elements I’ve set out above in order to grade the mind map.

**Mind map theory:** there are several of these and each has slightly different ideas about how to set up a mind map and what to include. If you are already using mind maps and you have a particular style that you like, please feel free to use this. If you’re new to mapping thinking in this way then explore a little to find what works for you.

I don’t mind which tool you use to develop the mind map, nor which mind mapping theory you use, as long as it includes the information outlined in the task description above.

*The critical reflection*

In the critical reflection, you will:

1. **Compare and contrast definitions and practices of wellbeing:**
   1. What are similarities and differences between the theories of wellbeing?
      1. That is, in what ways do these theories conceptualise wellbeing using similar ideas and suggesting similar practices?
      2. Where do they contradict/challenge each other?
2. **Research evidence:**
   1. What does the research evidence tell us about which of these practices are associated with increasing wellbeing?
3. **Bringing the theories together:**
   1. Which ideas and practices from both theories are important for improving wellbeing?
   2. What insights does bringing the theories together create for you in understanding wellbeing more holistically?

You need to reference the critical reflection and provide a separate References page. Please ensure that you use appropriate academic references. Don’t use a newspaper article from Huff Post (as fun as that is to read!) as your evidence. Go for peer-reviewed research – even better, peer-reviewed meta-analyses of a theory/a particular wellbeing practice and its relationship to wellbeing.
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**Marking Rubric for Assessment 3**

**OPTION 1**

| **Criteria** | **HD** | **D** | **C** | **P** | **F** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mind Map** | | | | | |
| **The quality of the mind map**  **5 marks** | A very high-quality presentation – excellent organization and use of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A high-quality presentation - very well organized and very good use of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A moderate-quality presentation – mostly well organized and good use of creative thinking in the design and creation. | A basic-quality presentation –evidence of basic organization and creative thinking in the design and creation. | Poor-quality presentation – disorganized with limited evidence of creative thinking in the design and creation. |
| **Identifying 2 theories, the definition of wellbeing and the wellbeing practices advocated by each theory.**  **5 marks** | Accurately reflects the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing. | Accurately reflects, with some minor omissions, the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | Several minor or a major omission in identifying the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | A number of inaccuracies identifying wellbeing practices – only partially reflects the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | Largely inaccurate or incomplete reflection of the theory and the associated practices. |
| **Critical reflection** | | | | | |
| **Identifying and summarizing the research evidence for the theory/wellbeing practices in terms of its relationship with wellbeing.**  **10 marks** | Identifies and summarises research support of the theories (or specific practices) to a very high standard, well considered and accurate.  Excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theories (or specific practices) to a high standard, well considered and accurate.  Very good to excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theory (or specific practices) to a fair standard, well considered and accurate.  Reasonable quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theory (or specific practices) to a basic standard, some inaccuracies or missing evidence.  Mixed quality of resources. | Research support is inaccurate or not included. Suitable resources have not been drawn upon. |
| **Bringing the two theories and associated wellbeing practices together**  **10 marks** | A comprehensive, creative and insightful analysis showing excellent critical thinking. | A thorough analysis which demonstrates considerable insight and very good critical thinking | A good analysis which demonstrates some evidence of critical thinking and insight. | A basic analysis. Some opportunities for identifying similarities and differences were missed. A reasonable effort in thinking critically. | Limited or no evidence of analyzing similarities and difference. Limited or no evidence of critical thinking. |
| **Overall comprehension, clarity and quality of your submission.**  **3 marks** | Purposeful, very well integrated, and succinct writing, which clearly conveys key points and insights, and flows logically. Writing is to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Largely purposeful, integrated, and succinct writing, which mostly clearly conveys key points and insights. Writing is mostly to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and mostly persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Writing occasionally lacks focus, integration, clarity and/or succinctness, and/or there may be errors or instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable. The errors occasionally affect comprehension and readability. | There are a number of errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures the meaning and readability some of the time. | There are many errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures meaning and readability. |
| **Word limit**  **2 marks** | Word limit met | Over or under word limit by 10 words | Over or under word limit by 25 words | Over or under word limit by 50 words | More than 50 words over or under the word limit |

**OPTION 2**

| **Criteria** | **HD** | **D** | **C** | **P** | **F** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identifying 2 theories, the definition of wellbeing and the wellbeing practices advocated by each theory.**  **5 marks** | Accurately reflects the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing. | Accurately reflects, with some minor omissions, the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | Several minor or a major omission in identifying the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | A number of inaccuracies identifying wellbeing practices – only partially reflects the theory’s conceptualization of wellbeing | Largely inaccurate or incomplete reflection of the theory and the associated practices. |
| **Identifying and summarizing the main research evidence for each theory/associated wellbeing practices in terms of its relationship with wellbeing.**  **10 marks** | Identifies and summarises research support of the theories (and/or associated practices) to a very high standard, well considered and accurate.  Excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theories (and/or associated practices) to a high standard, well considered and accurate.  Very good to excellent quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theory (and/or associated practices) to a fair standard, well considered and accurate.  Reasonable quality of resources, including peer-reviewed articles or books. | Identifies and summarises research support of the theory (and/or associated practices) to a basic standard, some inaccuracies or missing evidence.  Mixed quality of resources. | Research support is inaccurate or not included. Suitable resources have not been drawn upon. |
| **Bringing the two theories and associated wellbeing practices together**  **10 marks** | A comprehensive, creative and insightful analysis showing excellent critical thinking. | A thorough analysis which demonstrates considerable insight and very good critical thinking | A good analysis which demonstrates some evidence of critical thinking and insight. | A basic analysis. Some opportunities for identifying similarities and differences were missed. A reasonable effort in thinking critically. | Limited or no evidence of analyzing similarities and difference. Limited or no evidence of critical thinking. |
| **Overall comprehension, clarity and quality of your submission.**  **8 marks** | Purposeful, very well integrated, and succinct writing, which clearly conveys key points and insights, and flows logically. Writing is to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Largely purposeful, integrated, and succinct writing, which mostly clearly conveys key points and insights. Writing is mostly to the point (no waffle or extraneous information), and mostly persuasive and compelling, with appropriate use of spelling, grammar, and syntax. | Writing occasionally lacks focus, integration, clarity and/or succinctness, and/or there may be errors or instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable. The errors occasionally affect comprehension and readability. | There are a number of errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures the meaning and readability some of the time. | There are many errors, and instances of ineffective use of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and/or recognizable, which obscures meaning and readability. |
| **Word limit**  **2 marks** | Word limit met | Over or under word limit by 10 words | Over or under word limit by 25 words | Over or under word limit by 50 words | More than 50 words over or under the word limit |