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### Grading Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exceptional 1st** | | **1st** | **2.1** | | **2.2** | | **3rd** | | **Marginal fail** | | **Fail** | |
| **Competence in/ understanding of experimental design; specifically the understanding and enactment of a 2x2 factorial design** | | Exceptional knowledge and understanding of experimental design evidenced mostly through excellent setup of the hypothesised interaction effect with thorough theoretical justification; all design elements correctly understood. Thorough experimental control procedures. | Excellent knowledge and understanding of experimental design evidenced through a good setup of the hypothesised interaction effect (even if atheoretical); all design elements correctly understood; thorough experimental control procedures. | | Very good knowledge and understanding of experimental design evidenced through attempt to set up hypothesised interaction effect with clear setup of main effects and most design elements correctly understood. Some control procedures documented. | | Good knowledge and understanding of experimental design evidenced through clear setup of main effects and most design elements correctly understood; interaction effect documented but not thought through. Little attention to experimental control. | | Knowledge and understanding is sufficient to deal with terminology, basic facts and concepts, but some basic aspects of the experimental design have not been properly understood. Control procedures not documented. | | Insufficient knowledge and understanding of experimental design. Basic key errors give evidence of serious flaws in understanding of key concepts such as variables, design, control procedures. | | Highly insufficient knowledge or understanding of the area of study. No evidence of understanding even the basics of experimental design. |
| **Ability to set up and reason through an argument, in relation to evidence** | | Evidence of exceptional extensive and appropriate critical evaluation/synthesis beyond the prescribed range to direct arguments. The student is typically able to go beyond what has been taught. | Evidence of extensive and appropriate critical evaluation/synthesis beyond the prescribed range, to direct arguments. The student is typically able to go beyond what has been taught. | | Evidence of appropriate selection and critical evaluation of research. Able to relate facts and concepts with some ability to apply to known or taught contexts. Relies on set sources to direct arguments; synthesis of ideas is limited. | | Report is balanced towards the descriptive rather than analytical; evidence of appropriate selection and evaluation of reading/research but generally reliant on set sources. | | Some ability to select and evaluate reading/research however work may be more generally descriptive; arguments may be weak or poorly constructed. | | Insufficient knowledge and understanding of area of study; fails to address some aspects of the brief; arguments weakly constructed; structure not coherent. | | Highly insufficient knowledge or understanding of the area; de-contextualised or disjointed reproduction of facts. |
| **Competence in data handling, analysis and interpretation** | | Faultless data handling, skilful interpretation, examining findings in relation to the theoretical setup. Data processed thoroughly and appropriately. Methodological critique is fully synthesised with interpretation of findings. Figure and appropriate caption meets APA standards for editing and includes error bars. | Excellent data handling and thoughtful interpretation, examining findings in the light of the arguments developed in the introduction. Data are processed thoroughly and appropriately. Methodological critique used to further interpretation of findings.  Figure and appropriate caption meets APA standards for editing. | | Good data handling with an effort made to interpret the data, albeit with emphasis on main effects. Data processed thoroughly and appropriately. Methodological critique is thoughtful but not synthesised with interpretation of findings. Figure and appropriate caption lacks one or more features of APA standards for editing. | | Adequate data handling, but limited interpretation of findings, and a focus instead on standard methodological critique of study.  Figure pasted from SPSS and/or inappropriate caption. | | Some errors in data handling, and little if any effort to interpret the data. The discussion section focuses almost exclusively on received points of methodological critique. No figure and/or no caption. | | Poor data handling with misunderstandings of key elements of the data analysis. No interpretation of findings. No figure or depiction of means. | | Inadequate data handling and inadequate data analysis. No figure or depiction of means. |
| **Knowledge and understanding of psychological theory and/or application** | | A breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding of the literature which is beyond expectation; evidence of extensive research beyond the prescribed range. | A good knowledge and understanding of a relevant part of literature; evidence of reading beyond the prescribed range. | | Evidence of appropriate selection and evaluation of reading/research, some beyond the prescribed range; a reliance on set sources and received arguments. | | Descriptive review of a limited set of studies which in themselves have been adequately understood. | | Descriptive review of a limited set of studies with evidence of limited understanding of the individual studies themselves. | | Insufficient knowledge and understanding of the area of study with one or two references to relevant peer reviewed literature. | | Highly insufficient knowledge & understanding of area of study; no reference to relevant peer reviewed lit. |
| **Report writing skills and technical competence (clarity of expression, data display, report structure, referencing, use of Superlab)** | | Exceptional demonstration of report-writing skills; excellent structure at global and local level; excellent communication; faultless data display and reporting of statistics; faultless referencing; highly developed technical competence. | Excellent demonstration of report-writing skills; excellent communication; very good structure, at global and local level; good data display and reporting of statistics; good referencing; highly developed technical competence. | | Strong report-writing skills with minor weaknesses; appropriate structure, at global and local level; appropriate data display and reporting of statistics; competent referencing with some errors; good level of technical competence. | | Basic report-writing skills with noticeable weaknesses; some clarity but structure (local/global) not always coherent; adequate data display, reporting of statistics and referencing; adequate technical competence. | | Report-writing shows important weaknesses; general lack of clarity (local/global); significant weaknesses in data display, reporting of statistics and referencing; limited technical competence. | | Report-writing shows ltd clarity; poor presentation; structure (global/local) not coherent; inadequate data display, reporting of statistics and referencing; limited technical competence. | | Weaknesses in report-writing are a function of ltd. understanding; absence of appropriate data display and referencing. Very little evidence of technical competence. |