

Marking grid: Capstone Project, Bachelor in Psychology

Assessment 3: Capstone Project (60%)

Section	Weighting
Introduction	10%
Theoretical Framework and Literature Review	20%
Methodology	25%
Results and discussion	25%
Conclusion	10%
Overall coherence and presentation	10%

INTRODUCTION (10%)

MARKING CRITERIA
Appropriate background information has been provided, including all special terms, definitions, and rationale (what you are doing and why?)?
Are the research aim and research question(s) (or hypothesis) clear, relevant and achievable?

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive background information, definitions and rationale. Research aims and appropriate research question(s) / hypotheses are effectively synthesised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good background information, definitions and rationale. Clearly identifies aim and research question(s) / hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some good background information but lacking in some aspects. Identifies aim and research question(s) / hypotheses but lacking detail in some aspects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background information has some relevance but is lacking in some key aspects. Adequate identification of research area(s) but question(s) / hypotheses not well articulated or poorly explained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does give some indication of research areas but very limited background information. Lacks adequate identification of aim and research question(s) / hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irrelevant or very limited background information. Does not identify aim and / or research question(s) / hypotheses.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK LITERATURE REVIEW (20%)

MARKING CRITERIA
Has a comprehensive range of relevant academic literature, pertinent to the aim and research question(s) of the Capstone Project or is the impression given that current relevant academic literature on or around the problem has been included?
Does it attempt to compare and contrast a number of relevant concepts, models or theories in a critical manner or is it merely descriptive?
Are the key themes and issues surrounding the research question(s) clearly drawn from the literature?
Are the sources used up to date, where appropriate and do they have sufficient academic weight?
Have sources been acknowledged and referenced fairly and properly? Is the reference section at the end of the Dissertation complete and in the appropriate version of the Harvard Referencing system?

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive appraisal of relevant literature. Critical appraisal of relevant literature. Research question and the literature are synthesized and critical approach is evident. Very wide range of sources. Citations are always correct and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive appraisal of relevant literature. High level of critical appraisal. Related to research questions. Wide range of sources. Citations mainly correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate appraisal of mostly relevant literature. Some critical appraisal. Not always relevant to research questions. Acceptable range of sources. Citations are overall correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate discussion of some relevant literature. Tends towards the descriptive with very limited critical appraisal. Some relevance to research questions. Limited sources. Some citations correct but a number of errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature is limited in scope or irrelevant. Little appraisal and very descriptive. Limited relevance to research questions. Very limited sources. A large number of citation errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor and limited use of literature. Vague understanding of relevance of literature. Student appears to have relied heavily on too few texts. Extremely limited sources. Harvard Referencing system is not used when citing sources.

METHODOLOGY (25%)

MARKING CRITERIA
<p>Is there a clear rationale for the methodology i.e. is the student aware of the nature and types of research e.g. are distinctions between qualitative and quantitative, positivist and interpretative methods addressed?</p> <p>Have the alternatives been discussed and have the advantages and disadvantages of chosen methods been evaluated? Has this understanding informed their choice of approach?</p> <p>Is the methodology described appropriate for the data required?</p>
<p>Is the research methodology described fully so that it could be replicated?</p> <p>Are the research instruments well designed with all the research question(s) etc. relevant to the research aims?</p> <p>Are sampling methods described in detail in relation to sampling i.e. who are the respondents; how many are there; why and how were they selected?</p> <p>Is there evidence of care and accuracy in the data collection process?</p> <p>Are data analysis methods discussed?</p>
<p>Are reliability and validity issues addressed?</p> <p>Has the methodology been evaluated in retrospect with suggestions for improvement if the research were to be undertaken again?</p>

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a very clear synthesis of academic rationale for methodology and research approach. • Methods highly relevant to purpose with evidence of exploring alternative methods and choices well justified. • Sampling correct in all aspects and clearly explained. • Critical evaluation. • Overall approach very well planned and executed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a clear synthesis of academic rationale for methodology and research approach but perhaps not always well articulated. • Methods largely relevant to purpose with evidence of exploring alternative methods but incomplete justification. • All elements of sampling theory addressed with some being well done. • Evaluation may lack a critical approach in some aspects. • Generally, well planned and executed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some academic rationale for methodology/ approach but lacking detail in areas. • Methods not relevant to purpose in all aspects but has some good aspects. Justification for choice is limited. • All elements of sampling theory adequately addressed. • Evaluation has been attempted but is limited in terms of a critical approach. • There may be shortcomings in the planning and execution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited methodological rationale. • Methods have some relevance to purpose but have been insufficiently planned and executed. Justification for choice is very limited. • Sampling theory addressed but limited with omissions. • Evaluation is attempted and applied but is poor. • Overall planning and execution weak. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic rationale for methodology. • Methods are mainly irrelevant to purpose or are poorly explained and difficult to understand. • Sampling theory extremely weak and lacking detail. • Limited evaluation with very little actual application. • Poorly planned and executed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt at rationale for methodology. • Describes processes that do not relate to the purpose. • No sampling theory discussed. • No or very limited and vague evaluation. • Execution fails to achieve minimum standard required.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION (25%)

MARKING CRITERIA
Is the information presented relevant to the aims and objectives?
Does any table or graph presented make the most of the data collected?
Is any qualitative data categorised and presented systematically?
Are the findings presented clearly and interestingly for the reader to follow? i.e. is diagrammatic representation of data e.g. tables, charts etc embedded in the text?
Are the appendices used appropriately for bulky and/or less interesting/essential data? FOR QUESTIONNAIRES. Do the appendices contain a data summary sheet, a summary questionnaire and details of statistical analysis undertaken? FOR INTERVIEWS. Do the appendices contain data collected and analysed such as interview transcripts? FOR OBSERVATIONS. Do the appendices contain back up data on observations carried out?
Is the most relevant data clearly summarised, discussed and evaluated?
Have patterns in the data been identified and/or key variables compared and relationships highlighted?
Are all statements discussed in context and supported by the data?
Have the findings of the primary research been compared and contrasted with findings, theories, models or concepts derived from the literature review? Is the synthesis effective?

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and unambiguous presentation of data. • Relevant, rigorous and thorough analysis. • Very critical discussion and evaluation of findings. • Effective synthesis of findings and literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear presentation of data with few errors. • Relevant and thorough analysis. • Good discussion and evaluation of findings. • Good synthesis to the literature but some omissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally clear presentation of data but some errors. • Relevant analysis but lacks thorough approach. • Discussion and evaluation of findings lacks rigour but some useful findings. • Clear but partial linkage to the literature but many omissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of data is limited or lacks clarity. • Analysis is basic and pedantic in many areas. • Discussion and evaluation is superficial or relies on unsupported assertions. • Attempts linkage to the literature but not in a clear manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear or confusing presentation of data. • Analysis is basic and pedantic in all areas. • Discussion and evaluation is very limited or shows lack of understanding of evidence collected. • Minimal linkage to the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much or all of the data has been presented in an unclear manner. • No analysis or trivial. • No or very limited discussion of findings. • No or very weak linkage to the literature.

CONCLUSION (10%)

MARKING CRITERIA
Do the conclusions follow on from the findings? Are the conclusions well-grounded in the evidence and arguments presented?
Have the aim and research question(s) been clearly reviewed and addressed?
Are the conclusions discussed in context and are they applicable to a wider scenario?

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions valid and consistent with analysis. Comprehensive reference to aim, objectives and research questions. Conclusions discussed in detail and context and recognised applicable to wider scenario. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions valid and generally consistent with analysis. Good reference to aim, objectives and research questions. Conclusions discussed in context and recognised briefly that applicable to a wider. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions generally valid and partially consistent with analysis. Some reference to aim, objectives and research questions. Conclusions discussed in context and some recognition of wider application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some valid conclusions but generally inconsistent with analysis. Limited reference to aim, objectives and research questions. Conclusions briefly discussed in context and wider context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No obvious conclusions drawn or they are inconsistent with analysis. Very little attention to aim, objectives and research questions. Conclusions very briefly discussed in context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions do not relate to purpose. No attention to aim, objectives and the research questions. Conclusions not discussed in context.

OVERALL COHERENCE & PRESENTATION (10%)

MARKING CRITERIA
Is the overall style and presentation in accordance with that specified in the Guidelines? And particularly: Standard title page; length 10,000 words (+/-10%); correct pagination; chapter and section headings; tables and figures numbered correctly
Are ideas communicated in an effective way?
Is the Capstone Project coherent?

MARKING GRID					
70 - 100%	60 - 69%	50 - 59%	40 - 49%	20 - 39%	0 - 19%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfils all requirements and follows an acceptable style in a correct manner. Easy to read and leads the reader along a well-argued path. Has an overall coherence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfils most requirements and follows an acceptable style in a generally correct manner. Presented so that it is easy for reader to follow. Is generally coherent although it may lack coherence in parts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to follow an acceptable style and fulfils most of the requirements. Not presented with maximum clarity and sometimes difficult to follow the argument. Has acceptable coherence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally, attempts to conform to requirements and adequately executed. Some aspects of presentation unclear. Has limited coherence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet some of the key requirements. Fails to follow an acceptable style and some aspects unclear. Very little coherence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet many of the key requirements Fails to follow an acceptable style and often unclear an untidy. No coherence