RPS Annotated Bibliography teacher reference

Matching commentary for the teacher exercise. Open after teachers record independent judgements. Scores below refer to complete submissions, not the selected extracts.

Fictional AI-generated material for internal review and teacher standardisation. Proposed marks have not been agreed by human markers.

AB-X1

S01 distinguishes receiving composed messages from posting updates or one-click responses. This is precise reading of the evidence and supports evaluation of the active-use category. Whole response proposed AO1 18/20 and AO2 35/40, total 53/60.

AB-X2

S02 proposes a negative-then-positive structure and a general advantages/disadvantages conclusion. It establishes relevance but gives limited evidence of synthesis. A stronger project link would say how differences in measurement or population will be used to weigh the findings. Whole response proposed AO1 18/20 and AO2 23/40, total 41/60.

AB-X3

S03 wrongly treats temporal sequence as proof of causation and transfers a Facebook result to all social media. Repeated observations are useful, but do not remove confounding or establish an effect for every platform. These are AO2 reading/evaluation defects; they do not make the selected academic source invalid. Whole response proposed AO1 17/20 and AO2 13/40, total 30/60.

Approved AO1 ranges: 14–20, 12–13, 10–11, 8–9, 6–7, 0–5. Approved AO2 ranges: 28–40, 24–27, 20–23, 16–19, 12–15, 0–11. Use the full descriptors rather than a numerical range alone. No completed human standardisation is recorded.