

MINI-DISSERTATION MARKING RUBRIC 2,500 WORD APA-FORMAT (lab)REPORT WITH REFERENCES, OPEN MATERIALS, OPEN DATA and REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT
2023/4

Criteria	FAIL (UNSATISFACTORY)	3RD (SATISFACTORY)	LOWER 2ND (GOOD)	UPPER 2ND (VERY GOOD)	FIRST (EXCELLENT)
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 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 (Background)	General topic not presented. 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. Aims and rationale missing.	General topic area indicated. 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. Aims and rationale touched upon but not explicit.	Topic area introduced. Background research is reasonably clearly presented, including adequate relevant theory and/or empirical evidence. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) is mostly clear. Aims and rationale presented by in a limited fashion.	Topic area introduced clearly. Background research is clearly presented, including a range of relevant theory and/or empirical evidence. Relationship between claims and evidence (argument) is clear. Aims and rationale presented clearly.	Topic area introduced clearly and engagingly. 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. Aims and a compelling rationale for the study presented.
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.
Design section	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.
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.
Materials	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.
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 (Descriptives)	Summary missing, or very poorly written as to be incomprehensible. No use of graphs or tables.	A poorly written summary of the data was provided, possibly with missing info relating to the IV (inc. levels), and DV. Graphs or tables used, but not informative.	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. Graphs and tables used and value added.	A well written summary of the data was provided, where the IV (inc. levels), and the DV were mentioned. Graphs and tables used to further understanding.	An excellently written summary of the data was provided, where the IV (inc. levels), and the DV were fully and accurately reported. Graphs and tables deliver information clearly and succinctly working in harmony with the text, enhancing the narrative.
Results (ANOVA)	Incorrect or missing statistical test. Understanding not demonstrated. Statistical tests not correctly reported, or not reported at all.	Possibly incorrect statistical test used. Or correct test used but understanding not demonstrated. Some errors or missing info when statistical test reported.	Correct statistical test used, although may not demonstrate full understanding. Most info required for correct reporting of statistical tests included.	Correct statistical test used, and understanding demonstrated. Statistical test reporting correct in all aspects, perhaps lacking organisation or precision.	Correct statistical test used. Comprehensive understanding demonstrated. Statistical test reporting correct in all aspects, presented in a precise and organised fashion.
Discussion (Results)	Recap of results possibly not present, general results treatment difficult to read, or with information missing, and/or errors. Doesn't relate back to hypotheses or literature presented in the introduction.	Recap of results possibly not clear, general results treatment maybe features missing information, and some errors. Partially relates back to hypotheses or literature presented in the introduction.	Recap of results presented in a reasonably clear and logical way, general results treatment possibly including some minor errors. Mostly relates back to hypotheses or literature presented in the introduction.	Recap of results presented in a clear and logical way. General results treatment is logical and comprehensively achieved. Clearly relates back to hypotheses or literature presented in the introduction.	Recap of results presented in a very clear and logical and accessible way. General results treatment is logical, comprehensive, and shows clear understanding. Clearly relates back to hypotheses or literature presented in the introduction, comprehensively and with insight.
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 and/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 (Future 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	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	Largely inappropriate or incorrect tone with a lack of technical/scientific terminology. Overly long, potentially with poor spelling.	Largely appropriate tone, possibly using some incorrect technical/scientific terminology, perhaps long or with modest errors of presentation.	Largely appropriate tone with a generally good level of technical/scientific terminology throughout. Minor, infrequent errors of spelling or presentation.	Consistently good tone, with a generally good level of technical/scientific terminology. Isolated, noticeable inconsistencies. Generally succinct or with minor presentation issues.	Confident scientific tone used throughout, employing appropriate technical/scientific terminology consistently in all areas. Succinct and professional presentation.
Open Materials - Compulsory	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.
Open Data - Compulsory	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 is 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 - Compulsory	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.
A DECLARATION OF AI USE (OR NOT) IS COMPULSORY.					