Detailed Guidance (A reduced rubric will be attached to feedback, focussing on Title, Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion, Reference, Style, Supplementary Mats & Reflective Account)

Criteria		FAIL (UNSATISFACTORY)	3RD (SATISFACTORY)	LOWER 2ND (GOOD)	UPPER 2ND (VERY GOOD)	FIRST (EXCELLENT)
Title	Title	Title missing, extremely vague, or unrelated to the question at hand.	Poorly formulated title, attempting to give indication of the question at hand.	Reasonably formulated title, giving indication of question at hand	Concise, well formulated title, giving clear indication of question at hand	Concise, original, well formulated title, giving clear indication of question at hand
Abstract	Abstract	Abstract either missing or content may not be relevant for abstract. May not make sense, or is extremely unclear regarding content of the report.	Contains summary of some sections of the report, possibly not in correct order, or including less important elements. May be too short/long, or lacking in clarity.	Contains brief summary of most sections of the report in mostly correct order, mainly outlining the most important elements. May be too short/long.	Contains brief summary of each section of the report in the correct order, outlining only the most important elements.	Articulate, containing brief summary of each section of the report in the correct order, outlining only the most important elements with full technical clarity.
Introduction	Setting Scene	Area of interest may not be introduced, or it is very unclear what it is. Relevant terms are not defined, or very difficult to understand.	Some attempt at introducing area of interest. Possibly not clearly. Defines some relevant terms/concepts, possibly not well.	Introduces area of interest in a reasonably clear way. Defines most relevant terms/concepts.	Introduces area of interest in a clear and thoughtful way. Clearly defines relevant terms/concepts.	Introduces area of interest in an imaginative, engaging and thoughtful way. Fully defines relevant terms/concepts.
Introduction	Theoretical/empirical background	Substantial aspects of relevant background research, such as relevant theory or empirical evidence is missing or incorrectly reported. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) not clear or mentioned.	Either some relevant background research, such as relevant theory and/or empirical evidence is missing or incorrectly reported. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) not clear.	Background research is reasonably clearly presented, including adequate relevant theory and/or empirical evidence. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) is mostly clear.	Background research is clearly presented, including a range of relevant theory and/or empirical evidence. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) is clear.	Background research is very clearly presented and authoritative, including comprehensive overview of relevant theory and/or empirical evidence. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) is very clear.
Introduction	Open Question	Little or no justification for doing experiment given, or an incomprehensible one. Probably no outline of the open question, or why this question should be addressed (rationale).	A poor justification for doing the study given, possibly not related to the described background research. An outline of the open question possibly not included, nor why this question should be addressed (rationale).	A reasonable justification for doing the study given, which somewhat relates to the described background research. An outline of the open question included, and an attempt at why this question should be addressed (rationale).	A clear justification for doing the study given, which relates to the described background research. A good outline of the open question included, and why this question should be addressed (rationale).	A very clear justification for doing the study given, which relates to the described background research. An excellent outline of the open question included, and why this question should be addressed (rationale).
Introduction	Aims of present research	Proposed study probably not described at all, or incomprehensible. How the open question will be addressed probably not mentioned.	Proposed study poorly described, or not described at all. How the open question will be addressed possibly not mentioned.	Proposed study reasonably described, lacking clarity, and includes attempt at explaining how open question will be addressed.	Proposed study well described, explaining how open question will be addressed.	Proposed study described very well, explaining how open question will be addressed. Succinct and connected.
Introduction	Hypotheses	Hypotheses/predictions missing or incorrectly described. Probably not (or very poorly) relating back to open question/outlined background research.	Hypotheses/predictions poorly described. Possibly not (or poorly) relating back to open question/outlined background research.	Hypotheses/predictions that relate back to open question/outlined background research mostly described, possibly with minor errors.	Hypotheses/predictions that relate back to open question/outlined background research clearly described.	Hypotheses/predictions that relate back to open question/outlined background research very clearly described and presented logically.
Method	Design	IV, DV and type of design missing or very poorly reported. Many details may be missing or incorrect. Probably little or no attempt at spelling out relationship between experimental materials and levels of IV and measurement of DV.	IV, DV and type of design poorly reported. Some details may be missing or incorrect. Possibly little or no attempt at spelling out relationship(s) between experimental materials and levels of IV and measurement of DV.	IV (inc. levels), DV and type of design reasonably reported. Some minor details may be missing. Attempt at spelling out relationship(s) between experimental materials and levels of IV and measurement of DV.	IV (inc. levels), DV and type of design well reported, including details regarding counterbalancing/randomisation, and the like. Relationship(s) between experimental materials and levels of IV and measurement of DV largely available.	IV (inc. levels), DV and type of design excellently reported, including details regarding counterbalancing/randomisation, and the like. Relationship(s) between experimental materials and levels of IV and measurement of DV entirely clear and accurate.
Method	Participants	Mostly missing or incorrect information. Probably does not include many characteristics relevant to study, demographics, and how/where participants were recruited.	Some details described, possibly incorrectly. May not include characteristics relevant to study, demographics, and how/where participants were recruited. Probably some missing detail.	Main relevant details reasonably described, including characteristics relevant to study, demographics, and how/where participants were recruited. May be some minor missing detail.	All relevant details clearly described, including characteristics relevant to study, demographics, and how/where participants were recruited.	All relevant details excellently described, including characteristics relevant to study, demographics, and how/where participants were recruited.
Method	Materials/stimuli	Materials necessary to replicate experiment not described, probably with missing information and/or irrelevant detail.	Materials necessary to replicate experiment not adequately described, possibly with missing information and/or irrelevant detail.	Materials necessary to replicate experiment mostly described, possibly with some irrelevant detail, or minor missing info.	All materials necessary to replicate experiment described, clearly and concisely.	All materials necessary to replicate experiment fully described, in a technically appropriate, clear and concise way.
Method	Procedure	Procedure not present or missing lots of relevant info limiting replicability, or incorrect, possibly with extraneous information included. What occurred in experiment possibly difficult to understand.	An attempt at describing the procedure was made, possibly with missing info limiting replicability. What occurred during the experiment may not be clear. Extraneous information may be included.	The procedure was adequately described in a reasonably clear way, possibly with some missing info limiting replicability. A general idea of what the participant experienced was given. Some extraneous info may be included.	The procedure was described in a clear and concise way, with no missing info, such that the study could be replicated relatively accurately.	The procedure was described extremely well, in a clear and concise way, with no missing info, such that the study could be replicated fully and accurately.
Results	Descriptive statistics: Reporting	Summary missing, or very poorly written as to be incomprehensible.	A poorly written summary of the data was provided, possibly with missing info relating to the IV (inc. levels), and DV.	A reasonably written summary of the data was provided, where the IV (inc. levels), and the DV were mentioned. Possibly with unclear or minor missing elements.	A well written summary of the data was provided, where the IV (inc. levels), and the DV were mentioned.	An excellently written summary of the data was provided, where the IV (inc. levels), and the DV were fully and accurately reported.
Results	Descriptive statistics: Graphs/Tables	Graphs/tables incorrect or missing. Interpretation very difficult or impossible.	Graphs/tables incorrectly labelled and/or described, possibly missing info. Interpretation not always possible.	Graphs/tables mostly correctly labelled and described. Interpretation possible but required effort.	Graphs/tables correctly labelled and described. Interpretable.	Graphs/tables correctly labelled and well described, and very easy to interpret, adding to the narrative.
Results	Inferential: Choice of statistical test	Incorrect or missing statistical test. Understanding not demonstrated.	Possibly incorrect statistical test used. Or correct test used but understanding not demonstrated.	Correct statistical test used, although may not demonstrate full understanding.	Correct statistical test used, and understanding demonstrated.	Correct statistical test used. Comprehensive understanding demonstrated.
Results	Inferential: Reporting statistical tests	Statistical tests not correctly reported, or not reported at all.	Some errors or missing info when statistical test reported.	Most info required for correct reporting of statistical tests included.	Statistical test reporting correct in all aspects, perhaps lacking organisation or precision.	Statistical test reporting correct in all aspects, presented in a precise and organised fashion.
Discussion	Summary of findings	Recap of results possibly not present, difficult to read, or with information missing, and/or errors.	Recap of results possibly not clear maybe with some missing information, and some errors.	Recap of results presented in a reasonably clear and logical way, possibly with some minor errors.	Recap of results presented in a clear and logical way.	Recap of results presented in a very clear and logical and accessible way.
Discussion	Implications for open questions	May not have related results back to hypotheses, or considered implications for the open question. If done, the information would be mostly incomprehensible or incorrect.	Attempt at relating results back to the hypotheses made, possibly incorrectly or unclearly. Implications for the open question may not be mentioned, or unclear or with errors.	Attempt at relating results back to the hypotheses made. Implications for the open question mentioned, possibly not clearly, or in sufficient depth.	Results clearly related back to the hypotheses, and implications for the open question clearly discussed.	Results clearly related back to the hypotheses, and implications for the open question discussed in a clear and comprehensive way.
Discussion	Implications for theoretical/empirical background	Results not related back to research presented in the introduction, or what is done is completely incorrect.	Results may not be appropriately related back to research presented in the introduction, nor implications considered. They could be difficult to understand or incorrect.	Results related back to the research that is presented in the introduction. Attempt made at considering implications.	Results clearly related back to the research that is presented in the introduction and implications considered.	Results clearly related back to the research that is presented in the introduction. Implications considered in an original and insightful way.
Discussion	Limitations	Limitations to and/or alternative explanations for the results largely missing or very difficult to understand.	Limitations to and/or alternative explanations for the results possibly considered, but vague or general, or very difficult to understand.	Some limitations to an/or alternative explanations for the results considered in a reasonably sensible and coherent way, possibly somewhat general or underexplored.	Limitations to and alternative explanations for the results considered in a coherent way and explored well.	Limitations to and alternative explanations for the results considered insightfully, specific to the current study and fully explored.
Discussion	Further research	Possible directions the research could take may not be included, or are unrelated, or very difficult to understand.	Examples of possible directions the research could take are given but are vague, difficult to understand or lacking information or explanation.	Examples of possible directions the research could take are included, possibly slightly vague or without describing the value of such work.	Specific examples of possible directions the research could take are included, with clear reasons why this future research would be valuable.	Original, specific examples of possible directions the research could take are included, with very clear reasons why this future research would be highly valuable.
References	APA Referencing	Referencing contains many errors, including many incorrect references in text, and/or many errors in reference list (including missing articles, or even the whole list)	Referencing contains errors, including incorrect referencing in text, incorrectly formatted references in list, or missing references.	Good referencing, mostly correct in text and in list, with some errors.	Mostly perfect referencing, both in the text and in list, possibly with one or two errors.	Perfect referencing, both in the text and in list.
Style	Report structure & format	Incorrect structure probably with missing or incorrect section (e.g. Abstract, Introduction, Method (Participants, Design, Materials, Procedure), Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices if needed). APA formatting missing or poorly followed.	Poor structure with possibly missing sections (e.g. Abstract, Introduction, Method (Participants, Design, Materials, Procedure), Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices if needed). Presentable, but not according to APA formatting.	Reasonable structure with all relevant sections inc. Abstract, Introduction, Method (Participants, Design, Materials, Procedure), Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices if needed. May be some minor errors. APA formatting followed, but some aspects missing.	Good structure with all relevant sections inc. Abstract, Introduction, Method (Participants, Design, Materials, Procedure), Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices if needed. APA format followed generally well.	Good structure with all relevant sections inc. Abstract, Introduction, Method (Participants, Design, Materials, Procedure), Results, Discussion, References, and Appendices if needed. APA format fully followed with excellent attention to detail.
Style	Scientific voice	Largely inappropriate or incorrect tone with a lack of technical/scientific terminology, maybe with incongruous everyday langauge or slang.	Largely appropriate tone, possibly using some incorrect technical/scientific terminology, maybe with minor incongruous everyday language or slang.	Largely appropriate tone with a generally good level of technical/scientific terminology throughout. A number of inconsistencies.	Consistently good tone, with a generally good level of technical/scientific terminology. Isolated, noticeable inconsistencies.	Confident scientific tone used throughout, employing appropriate technical/scientific terminology consistently in all areas. No areas of inconsistency.
Style	Succinctness/precision	Writing is imprecise and consistently overly long or repetitive.	A number of instances of imprecision and a tendency towards overly long sentences or paragraphs.	Only a few instances of imprecise language and/or examples of content that could have been presented more succinctly.	Generally succinct and precise throughout with only minor improvements required.	Succinct and precise throughout without loss of detail or clarity.
Style	Grammar/spelling	Many grammatical and/or spelling errors possibly impacting on communication of information or understanding.	A number of grammatical and/or spelling errors possibly impacting on communication of information or understanding.	Only infrequent errors impacting on communication of information or understanding.	Only infrequent errors noted, with no substantive impact on communication of information or understanding.	No noticeable errors impacting communication of information or understanding.
Supplementary Materials	Open Materials	Open Materials not submitted. Replication of study impossible.	Open Materials submitted, but incomplete. Approximate replication of study difficult but not impossible.	Open Materials submitted, largely complete, but poorly organised or difficult to navigate. Effective replication possible, but either partial or with some difficulty.	Open Materials submitted, largely complete and generally well organised and navigable. Effective replication achievable with minimal difficulty.	Open Materials submitted, complete, well-organised, and easy to navigate. Demonstrates understanding of Open Science principles. Direct replication of study possible with almost no difficulty.
Supplementary Materials	Open Data	Open Data not submitted. Re-analysis impossible.	Open Data submitted, but incomplete. Partial re-analysis possible, but difficult.	Open Data submitted, largely complete, but poorly organised or difficult to navigate. Complete re-analysis possible, but with some difficulty.	Open Data submitted, largely complete and generally well organised and navigable. Re-analysis achievable with minimal difficulty.	Open Data submitted, complete, well-organised, and easy to navigate. Demonstrates understanding of Open Science principles. Full re-analysis possible with almost no difficulty.
Reflective Account	Reflective Account	No reflective account was submitted or it was not completed in the appropriate spirit.	Reflective account submitted and generally describes the student's experience without analysis or connection to learning or development in Research Methods or more widely.	Reflective account submitted and contains a number of reflections on the student's experience and shows evidence of efforts to derive meaning and aid learning or development in Research Methods or more widely.	Reflective account submitted and contains insightful reflections on the student's experience and clearly illustrates a critical perspective, self-awareness and understanding in relation to Research Methods or more widely.	Reflective account submitted and contains well-chosen, authentic reflections on the student's experience and shows evidence of gaining new knowledge relevant to the discipline, themselves, their situation and their academic development.