

| Criterion                      |        | Demonstrated level of achievement  |   |   |   |  |   |                                       |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|---|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Introduction                   | Weight | Full marks (HD+)   | Exemplary (HD)  | Accomplished (D)  | Competent (C)   | Developing (P)   | Beginning (N)   | Not attempted (N)                     |
| a. Introducing the topic/issue | 5      | <p>5 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Identifies and describes the topic/issue that is being addressed.</p> <p>Provides a clear, strong argument for the need for research to address the issue.</p>  | <p>4 points</p> <p>Correctly identifies and describes the topic very well. Provides a solid argument for the need for research to address the issue. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p>   | <p>3.5 points</p> <p>Correctly identifies and describes the topic fairly well. Some attempt to build an argument for the need for research to address the issue.</p>  | <p>3 points</p> <p>Correctly identifies the topic and description is provided with some room for improvement. Little to no attempt to build an argument for the need for research to address the issue.</p>   | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>Correctly identifies the topic (or with minor issue) but description needs major improvement. Little to no attempt to build an argument for the need for research to address the issue.</p>   | <p>1.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. The incorrect topic is identified.</p>                             | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| b. Literature review           | 15     | <p>15 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Understands and communicates scientific findings and includes only relevant information. Previous studies are accurately represented.</p> <p>Provides critical evaluation of evidence, synthesis, and argument building.</p> | <p>12 points</p> <p>Largely understands how to interpret and communicate scientific research and all information included is relevant and accurate. Good demonstration of critical evaluation of evidence, synthesis, and argument building across findings of different studies.</p> | <p>10.5 points</p> <p>Few misrepresentations or misunderstandings of scientific findings and little to no irrelevant information. Some attempt at critical evaluation of evidence, synthesis, or argument building is provided at a few points.</p> | <p>9 points</p> <p>There may be several misunderstandings of findings. Information provided is largely relevant, but there may be a few exceptions. There may be more summarisation than synthesis. There may be little to no critical evaluation of evidence or argument building.</p> | <p>7.5 points</p> <p>There was an attempt to provide some relevant information, but there may be substantial irrelevant information, significant misunderstandings of scientific information, and or insufficient detail. There may be little to no critical evaluation of evidence, synthesis (or summarisation), or argument building.</p> | <p>4 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Literature included is entirely irrelevant to research question.</p> | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |

|  |   |  |   |  |  |   |  |                                       |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| c. Defining key terms  | 5 | <p>5 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Key terms are defined accurately, clearly, and concisely as they arise logically in the introduction with no noticeable room for improvement.</p>   | <p>4 points</p> <p>All key terms defined accurately, clearly, and concisely. Most are placed logically within the introduction; one may be better placed.</p>   | <p>3.5 points</p> <p>All key terms defined accurately, but could be mild improvements in terms of clarity, concision, or placement within the introduction for most.</p>   | <p>3 points</p> <p>All key terms defined, but could be considerable improvements in terms of accuracy, clarity, concision, or placement within the introduction for most.</p>                          | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>Most key terms defined, and could be considerable improvements in terms of accuracy, clarity, concision, or placement for those included.</p>                                | <p>1.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Most key terms not defined. Definition/s provided may also need considerable improvements in terms of accuracy, clarity, concision, or placement.</p> | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| d. Identifying unknown element and rationale for current study | 7 | <p>7 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Identifies an appropriate and specific unknown element of topic (i.e., gap) that follows logically from literature review and aligns with aim.</p> <p>Makes a strong argument for why the unknown is worth exploring (i.e., why gap needs to be addressed).</p> | <p>5.6 points</p> <p>Unknown element identified is highly appropriate and a sound argument is provided for why it is worth addressing. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p> | <p>4.9 points</p> <p>Unknown element identified is largely appropriate and there was an attempt at describing why the unknown needs to be addressed, but the argument could have been more detailed or convincing.</p> | <p>4.2 points</p> <p>Unknown element is identified but may not be appropriate considering the aim or sufficiently specific. There is a weak argument provided for the need to address the unknown.</p> | <p>3.5 points</p> <p>Unknown element may not be appropriate considering the aim or may be somewhat unclear. There is also little to no argument provided for the need to address the unknown.</p> | <p>1.75 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. The unknown element may not be clearly identified.</p>   | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| e. Aim of current study  | 3 | <p>3 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Accurately states the specific aim that follows</p>   | <p>2.4 points</p> <p>Aim is accurate, specific, and logically extends from rationale. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p>  | <p>2.1 points</p> <p>Aim is mainly logical and specific and extends from rationale. Aim contains some inaccuracies, vagueness, or inefficiencies.</p>  | <p>1.8 points</p> <p>Aim mainly extends logically from rationale. Aim may be overly broad. Aim contains some inaccuracies, vagueness, or inefficiencies.</p>   | <p>1.5 points</p> <p>Aim somewhat extends from rationale, but is overly broad, inaccurate, vague, or inefficient.</p>   | <p>0.75 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology.</p>  | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |

|                         |        | logically from the rationale for the current study.  |  |   |  |  | Aim is inconsistent with prior findings and rationale.  |                                       |
|-------------------------|--------|--|--|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| f. Hypotheses           | 10     | <p>10 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Specific hypotheses are stated accurately, clearly, and efficiently. Predictions logically flow from previous literature and rationale.</p>                | <p>8 points</p> <p>Hypotheses are specific and are expressed clearly and efficiently. Hypotheses flow from previous literature and rationale. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p> | <p>7 points</p> <p>Hypotheses are specific and linked to previous literature and rationale. May contain slight inefficiencies or confusion.</p> | <p>6 points</p> <p>Hypotheses are linked to previous literature and rationale in general terms. Link could be more explicit. May contain slight inefficiencies, confusion, or vagueness.</p> | <p>5 points</p> <p>Hypotheses are relevant but not linked to previous literature and rationale or are insufficiently specific.</p>           | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Hypotheses may be inconsistent with the reviewed literature or the task.</p> | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| Method                  | Weight | Full marks (HD+)   | Exemplary (HD)   | Accomplished (D)  | Competent (C)  | Developing (P)   | Beginning (N)   | Not attempted (N)                     |
| a. Participants section | 10     | <p>10 points</p> <p>Skill is demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Clearly describes participant recruitment and important sample details.</p>  | <p>8 points</p> <p>Participant recruitment information and details are reported correctly with little to no missing information. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p>              | <p>7 points</p> <p>Participant recruitment information and details are reported correctly but may have a few pieces of missing information.</p> | <p>6 points</p> <p>Participant recruitment information may have several pieces of missing information or may be reported incorrectly.</p>  | <p>5 points</p> <p>Participant recruitment information is reported incorrectly and has several pieces of missing information.</p>            | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology.</p>  | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| b. Measures section     | 10     | <p>10 points</p> <p>Skill is demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Clearly describes how variables are operationalised and measured in lab report study such that an independent reader could replicate the study as conducted.</p> | <p>8 points</p> <p>How key variables are operationalised is clear with little to no missing or unclear information about measures. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p>            | <p>7 points</p> <p>How key variables are operationalised is clear but some information about measures may be missing.</p>                       | <p>6 points</p> <p>How key variables are operationalised may be somewhat unclear and some information about measures may be missing.</p>   | <p>5 points</p> <p>How key variables are operationalised is unclear and substantial amount of key information about measures is missing.</p> | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Measures are inaccurately described or protocol cannot be replicated.</p>    | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |

|                                 |               |  |  |   |   |  |  |                                       |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| c. Procedure section            | 10            | <p>10 points</p> <p>Skill is demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Clearly describes the ethical procedure of the lab report study such that an independent reader could replicate the study as conducted.</p>                                      | <p>8 points</p> <p>Procedural information is presented coherently with all key details and consideration of ethics. Could be mild improvements in terms of clarity or concision.</p> | <p>7 points</p> <p>Procedural information is presented coherently with most key details and consideration of ethics.</p>  | <p>6 points</p> <p>Procedural information may be missing some key details and may not consider ethics.</p>  | <p>5 points</p> <p>Procedural information is missing several key details and does not consider ethics.</p>                       | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Procedure is inaccurately described or protocol cannot be replicated.</p>               | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| <b>Scientific communication</b> | <b>Weight</b> | <b>Full marks (HD+)</b>  | <b>Exemplary (HD)</b>  | <b>Accomplished (D)</b>   | <b>Competent (C)</b>  | <b>Developing (P)</b>  | <b>Beginning (N)</b>   | <b>Not attempted (N)</b>              |
| a. Evidence                     | 7             | <p>7 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Evidence (in the form of references or reasoning) provided for all assertions of fact.</p>  | <p>5.6 points</p> <p>Logical and convincing arguments wholly supported with directly relevant articles and reasoning.</p>  | <p>4.9 points</p> <p>Mostly logical and convincing arguments predominantly supported with directly relevant articles and reasoning with occasional confusion.</p> | <p>4.2 points</p> <p>On balance, logical arguments generally supported with relevant articles or reasoning, or presents relevant articles with limited argumentation.</p> | <p>3.5 points</p> <p>Weak arguments supported with tangentially relevant articles or reasoning or have insufficient breadth.</p> | <p>1.75 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Use of scholarly work and reasoning is irrelevant, insufficient, or inappropriate.</p> | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |
| b. Argument structure           | 6             | <p>6 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Argument is structured in a logical manner and is integrated by using topic and concluding sentences within paragraphs and well considered between-paragraph structure.</p> | <p>4.8 points</p> <p>All content is logically presented and integrated with good within- and between-paragraph structure.</p>  | <p>4.2 points</p> <p>Content is mainly organised within and between paragraphs.</p>   | <p>3.6 points</p> <p>Content is largely organised within or between paragraphs.</p>   | <p>3 points</p> <p>Content is disorganised within or between paragraphs.</p>   | <p>1.5 points</p> <p>An attempt was made but the student did not demonstrate the fundamental skills to the minimum standard for first year psychology. Most content rendered irrelevant due to structure or skeleton overview submitted.</p>   | <p>0 points</p> <p>Not attempted.</p> |

|  |               |  |   |  |   |   |  |                          |
|--|---------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| c. Written expression                        | 2             | <p>2 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>Written expression is clear and appropriately academic in tone.</p> | <p>1.6 points</p> <p>Written expression was easy to understand. An appropriately formal tone was used. There were approx. ≤2 errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.</p> | <p>1.4 points</p> <p>Written expression was easy to understand. An appropriately formal tone was used. There were approx. 3-4 errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.</p> | <p>1.2 points</p> <p>Written expression was mostly easy to understand, though tone may have been informal in places. There were approx. 5+ errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.</p> | <p>1 point</p> <p>Written expression was difficult to understand at times. There were multiple errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.</p> | <p>0.5 points</p> <p>Written expression was difficult to understand most of the time. There were consistent errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.</p> | N/A                      |
| d. Word limit is adhered to.                 | 2             | <p>2 points</p> <p>Within word limit.</p>  | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   | N/A   | <p>0 points</p> <p>Exceeds word limit.</p>   | N/A                      |
| <b>Formatting and referencing</b>            | <b>Weight</b> | <b>Full marks (HD+)</b>  | <b>Exemplary (HD)</b>   | <b>Accomplished (D)</b>  | <b>Competent (C)</b>  | <b>Developing (P)</b>   | <b>Beginning (N)</b>   | <b>Not attempted (N)</b> |
| a. APA7 formatting                           | 3             | <p>3 points</p> <p>All skills are demonstrated to the highest standard with no noticeable room for improvement:</p> <p>The document is consistently formatted as per APA7 style.</p>       | <p>2.4 points</p> <p>Formatting and referencing are according to APA style the majority of the time with very few minor errors.</p>   | <p>2.1 points</p> <p>Formatting and referencing are according to APA style the majority of the time with only a few errors that may be major.</p>                              | <p>1.8 points</p> <p>Formatting and referencing are according to APA style with several significant errors.</p>   | <p>1.5 points</p> <p>Formatting and referencing were sometimes according to APA style with major errors.</p>                                    | <p>0.75 points</p> <p>There was no attempt to use APA style formatting and referencing.</p>  | N/A                      |
| <b>Additional reference</b>                  | <b>Weight</b> | <b>Full marks (HD+)</b>  | <b>Exemplary (HD)</b>   | <b>Accomplished (D)</b>  | <b>Competent (C)</b>  | <b>Developing (P)</b>   | <b>Beginning (N)</b>   | <b>Not attempted (N)</b> |
| a. Proof of appropriate additional reference | 5             | <p>5 points</p> <p>Cited and provided a reference for at least ONE additional journal article that was relevant and appropriate.</p>   | N/A   | N/A  | <p>2.5 points</p> <p>Cited and provided a reference for ONE additional journal article but it was not relevant or appropriate.</p>  | N/A   | <p>0 points</p> <p>No additional journal articles were cited and referenced.</p>   | N/A                      |