

1	<b>Personality Score Description</b>	Student fails to describe what their personality scores on each domain infer about their personality. [0]	Student provides a poor description of what their scores on each domain infer about their personality, lacking detail across most domains. [1]	Student provides a good description of what their scores on each domain infer about their personality, with detail lacking on one or more domains. [2]	Student provides a very good description of what their scores on each domain infer about their personality characteristics. [3]	Student provides an excellent, clear, and succinct description of what their scores on each domain infer about their personality characteristics. [4]
1	<b>Peer Personality Comparisons</b>	Student does not address the level of variation from their peers with regards to the domains of personality. [0]	Student provides either an inaccurate description of the levels of variation from their peers on each personality domain, or omits a description for one or more domains. [1]	Student provides an accurate description of the level of variation from their peers on each personality domain. [2]	Student provides an accurate description of the level of variation from their peers on each personality domain, referring to figures in-text to support their description. [3]	Student provides an accurate description of the level of variation from their peers on each personality domain, supported by a relevant statistical indicator of this level of variation. Figures are referred to in-text, and support the description. [4]
1	<b>Self-Perception Accuracy</b>	Student does not address or addresses poorly the correspondence between the domain scores and their self-perception of their personality. [0]	Student describes correspondence between scores and self-perception without examples to support their discussion. [1.5]	Student describes correspondence between scores and self-perception. Examples are presented but not well-integrated into the discussion on the accuracy of the scale. [3]	Student describes correspondence between scores and self-perception. Examples are provided for each domain, and demonstrate the student's stance on the accuracy of the scale. [4.5]	Student clearly and succinctly describes correspondence between scores and self-perception. Examples are provided for each domain, are highly relevant to peer comparisons, and demonstrate the student's stance on the accuracy of the scale. [6]

1	<b>Figure/s</b>	Student omits to include a figure. [0]	Student inaccurately represents where their scores on the NEO domains lie in respect to their peers in the unit. [0.5]	Student provides an accurate demonstration of where their scores on the NEO domains lie in respect to their peers in the unit. [1]	Student graphically provides an accurate demonstration of where their scores on the NEO domains lie with respect to their peers in the unit via a normal distribution. [1.5]	Student graphically provides a clear, accurate demonstration of where their scores on the NEO domains lie with respect to their peers in the unit via a normal distribution. [2]
2	<b>Personality and Performance</b>	The student does not address, or addresses very poorly, the expected personality domain and tertiary academic performance relationship. [0]	Student provides a summary of expected relationships between personality domain/s and tertiary academic performance. Details are lacking, and the structure impedes clarity. [3.5]	Student provides a summary of the expected relationships between the five factor personality domains and tertiary academic performance, referencing academic literature. Clarity and structure could be improved. [5]	Student provides a good summary of the expected relationships between the five factor personality domains and tertiary academic performance, as suggested by academic literature. [6.5]	Student provides a well-integrated summary of the expected relationships between the five factor personality domains and tertiary academic performance, as suggested by aggregated academic literature. [8]
2	<b>Personality and Academic Performance Accuracy</b>	Student does not address, or addresses very poorly, whether their perceived academic performance and personality scores are reflective of the expected relationships in the literature. [0]	Student superficially addresses whether their perceived academic performance and personality scores bear resemblance to the relationships suggested in the literature. [2]	Student partially addresses whether their perceived academic performance and personality scores are reflective of the expected relationships in the literature, with limited example substantiation. [3.5]	Student provides a good description of whether their perceived academic performance and personality scores are reflective of the expected relationships suggested in the literature, substantiated by examples. [4.5]	Student provides an excellent description of whether their perceived academic performance and personality scores are reflective of the expected relationships suggested in the literature, substantiated by highly relevant examples. [6]

3	<b>Critical Thinking on Validity</b>	Student does not address or addresses very poorly a description of the relevant validity considerations relevant to their personality and academic performance. Critical thinking is not demonstrated in a sufficient capacity. [0]	An unclear or vague explanation of which generic facets of validity are valuable to consider. Critical thinking is poorly demonstrated in the description of how these facets of validity are relevant to the consideration of their personality and academic performance. [3]	A good explanation of which facets of validity are valuable to consider. Student demonstrates limited critical thinking skills with regard to explaining how these validity facets may be relevant to the consideration of their personality and academic performance. [5]	A good explanation of which facets of validity are valuable to consider. Student demonstrates critical thinking skills when explaining how the suggested facets of validity may be relevant to the consideration of their personality and academic performance. [6.5]	A clear, succinct explanation of which facets of validity are valuable to consider. Student demonstrates highly developed critical thinking skills when explaining how the suggested facets of validity may be relevant to the consideration of their personality and academic performance. [8]
R	<b>APA6/7 Referencing</b>	Severe departures from APA6/7 style are presented in the submitted work. [0]	A poor demonstration of APA6/7 style referencing for both the in-text and end-text components. [0.5]	A good demonstration of APA6/7 style referencing, with several errors noted either in-text or end-text. [1]	A very good demonstration of APA6/7 style referencing. [1.5]	Almost flawless execution of APA6/7 style for the in-text and end-text components. [2]