

Marking Criteria: Research (Lab) Report

Research Quality					
	UNSATISFACTORY	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP
Critical evaluation of the literature (5 marks)	Summaries of scientific papers are either absent from the introduction, or studies and/or theories are simply mentioned without any attempt to summarise the details. There is no critical evaluation. Re-evaluation of points in the Discussion section is either absent or unclear.	A clear attempt has been made to summarise at least one relevant scientific paper in the Introduction (from the theoretical and/or empirical literature), but there is no critical evaluation. Re-evaluation of points in the Discussion is either absent or unclear.	At least one relevant scientific paper is summarised in the Introduction (from the theoretical and/or empirical literature). There is a basic attempt to critically evaluate theories and/or empirical methods in the Introduction, and some evidence of an attempt to re-evaluate key points explicitly in the Discussion in light of the study's findings.	At least two relevant scientific papers are summarised in the Introduction (from the theoretical and/or empirical literature). There is a clear attempt to critically evaluate theories and empirical methods in the Introduction, and a clear attempt to re-evaluate key points explicitly in the Discussion in light of the study's findings.	A wide range of relevant scientific papers from the theoretical and/or empirical literature is summarised concisely in the Introduction. There is clear critical evaluation of theories and/or empirical methods in the Introduction, and key points are re-evaluated explicitly in the Discussion in light of the study's findings.
Support from appropriate scholarly sources (5 marks)	Argument premises (including technical definitions, theoretical perspectives, and empirical research) are not adequately supported by scholarly sources.	There is a clear attempt to support the argument premises (including technical definitions, theoretical perspectives, and empirical research) using primary or secondary sources, at least some of the time.	Most or all of the argument premises (including definitions, theoretical perspectives, and empirical research) are referenced using primary sources though there may be some secondary sources.	All of the argument premises (including technical definitions, theoretical perspectives, and empirical research) are referenced using primary scholarly sources.	All argument premises (including technical definitions, theoretical perspectives, and empirical research) are referenced using primary scholarly sources, and often with more than one appropriate reference.

Lab Report Structure and Execution					
	UNSATISFACTORY	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP
Title (2 marks)	The title is absent or irrelevant.	The title does not clearly express the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.	There is a clear attempt to express the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, but the title lacks clarity and/or conciseness.	The title expresses the research question clearly and concisely, accurately stating the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.	
Abstract (4 marks)	The abstract is absent or cannot be followed.	There is an attempt to summarise the report, but the abstract is generally unclear and may be missing one or more of the following elements: an overview of the study aims, participants, method, findings, whether the hypotheses were supported, and implications of the findings.	There is an attempt to include all of the elements of the abstract (an overview of the study aims, participants, method, findings, whether the hypotheses were supported, and implications of the findings), but the abstract is unclear in one or two elements and/or significantly exceeds the 180 word limit.	The abstract summarises the study clearly and concisely, within 180 words. It includes all of the following elements: an overview of the study aims, the participants, and the method, leading to a concise statement of key findings, including whether hypotheses were supported, and brief statement of key implications of the findings.	
Introduction (5 marks)	The introduction is entirely absent, or what is written does not present any logical argument to justify the study.	There is an attempt to present a logical justification for the study in the introduction, but many sentences do not flow logically from one to the next and one or more of the crucial elements is entirely absent: an outline of the topic, an explanation of the importance of the research area, definitions of key terms and concepts, statements of the dependent and independent variables, the aim of the study, and of the hypotheses.	The topic is outlined, and there is an attempt to explain the importance of the research area, with definitions of most of the relevant key terms and concepts. There is an attempt to state the study aim(s) but the argument/ rationale justifying the aim(s) is unclear. An attempt has been made to provide an indication of the dependent and independent variables, and of the hypotheses, and at least an attempt has been made to provide a logical justification for them.	The topic is outlined and the importance of the research area explained, with definitions of key terms and concepts. There is a clear statement of the study aim(s) and a clear attempt has been made to justify the aim(s) using a logical argument. There is also a clear statement of the dependent and independent variables, and of the hypotheses, and at least an attempt has been made to provide a logical justification for them.	The topic is outlined concisely and the importance of the research area explained, with definitions of key terms and concepts, and a clear argument concludes with the study aim(s). The dependent and independent variables are justified logically and the introduction concludes with a clear statement of hypotheses.

Lab Report Structure and Execution (cont.)					
	UNSATISFACTORY	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP
Discussion (4 marks)	The discussion is absent, or what is written cannot be followed.	A statement of whether the hypotheses were supported is either absent, or the results are simply restated. There is no clear attempt to explain why the finding is important or how it advances scientific knowledge. Suggestions for future research are absent, unclear, implausible, or overemphasise methodological issues.	The discussion begins with a clear statement of whether the hypotheses were supported, followed by a clear attempt to explain why the finding is important and how it advances scientific knowledge by linking to literature discussed in the introduction. At least one suggestion for future research is provided, but it may not be justified logically or it may overemphasise methodological issues.	The discussion begins with a clear statement of whether the hypotheses were supported, followed by a clear attempt to explain why the finding is important and how it advances scientific knowledge. Suggestions for methodological improvements are provided, if applicable. An attempt has been made to justify logically the suggestions for future research, which mention at least one of the following three things: potential development of theory, potential development of research, or implications for the real world.	The discussion begins with a clear statement of whether the hypotheses were supported, followed by an argument for why the finding is important and how it advances scientific knowledge. If suggestions for methodological improvements are provided, they are relevant and accompanied by sound reasoning. Suggestions for future research are justified logically and concentrate most heavily on potential development of theory and/or research, and on implications for the real world.
Presentation and Academic Styling					
	UNSATISFACTORY	NOVICE	PROFESSIONAL		
Formatting (1 mark)	The report has several formatting errors (title page, margins, line spacing, font size, etc.), according to the Learning Guide.	The report is mostly formatted correctly (title page, margins, line spacing, font size, etc.), according to the Learning Guide.	The report is entirely formatted correctly (title page, margins, line spacing, font size, etc.), according to the Learning Guide.		

Presentation and Academic Styling (cont.)			
	UNSATISFACTORY	NOVICE	PROFESSIONAL
Spelling and Grammar (1 mark)	There are many spelling and/or grammatical errors.	There are a few spelling or grammatical errors.	There are no spelling or grammatical errors.
Formal Academic Style (1 mark)	The report is written using informal language.	The report has aspects of formal academic style, but also uses some informal style.	A clear attempt has been made to write the report in formal academic style.
In-Text Referencing (1 mark)	The formatting of most in-text references is <i>not</i> correct APA style.	The formatting of most in-text references is correct APA style.	The formatting of in-text references is perfect, or near perfect, APA style.
Reference List (1 mark)	The reference list formatting is mostly incorrect. It may contain many APA formatting errors or references that are not cited in the report. Sources cited in the report may be absent from the reference list.	The reference list formatting is mostly correct. It may contain systematic APA formatting errors or a reference that was not cited in the report. All sources cited in the report are in the reference list.	The reference list formatting is perfect or near-perfect. It may contain one or two minor slips in APA formatting, but the vast majority of references are formatted according to APA style. All items in the reference list were cited in the report, and sources cited in the report are all in the reference list.