


Feedback on summative gravity practical question, earlier year

- Most people used density instead of density contrast to calculate gravity effect of magma chamber
- Many people measured the absolute Bouguer anomaly and not the relative one for the caldera – values of 100s of mGal are bound to be wrong



362

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, earlier year

- “Bouguer anomaly” and “Free-air anomaly” maps do not require separate surveys
- Things cannot be “proven” by gravity or other geophysical surveys
- There is no room for “belief” in science.
- The concept of something that is “required” and “permitted” by the data

363

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, earlier year

- Don't waste time word-processing workings & maths
- Separate km from the preceding number
- Indent paragraphs
- A summary write up should be an executive summary - it should be **neat, clear**, and clearly state the results and the bottom line

364

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, 2006

- Concepts:
 - The results **are consistent with** or **permit**
 - The results **require/do not require**
- 2nd derivative figures - do they show the results you expect?

365

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, 2006

- Too many significant figures, e.g., $A = 0.004125402$ mGal
- (3 dp) etc
- Wrong capitalisation
- Space between # and units
2km - wrong. Should be 2 km
- Bishops Tuff - wrong - should be Bishop Tuff
- Word processing lots of calculations

366

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, 2006

- An executive summary should stand alone
- Answer =
- No units quoted
- The word data is plural
- Keep the background relevant
- Solid pages of text

367

Feedback on summative gravity practical question, 2006

- Waffly introductions
- Spell check your work
- Fluffy prose
- Referencing style
- Paragraphing