

**Introduction to the topic, literature review, discussion of the research hypothesis and aims of the project, identification of the readership of the project (30%)**

**Main aspects**

- Knowledge and understanding of the substantive issues
- Knowledge of critical contributions on the substantive issues
- Ability to organise research material to support an argument
- Ability to present an argument

**70 and above - equivalent to a distinction**

An outstanding piece of work in every regard which demonstrates:

- A thorough and wide-ranging knowledge of the substantive issues
- A thorough and insightful understanding of the substantive issues involved
- An ability to analyse critical contributions on the substantive issues
- An ability to research and bring together material to support an argument
- An ability to express an original, reasoned argument in a lucid manner

**60-69 – equivalent to an upper second**

A good piece of work which demonstrates:

- A sound understanding of the substantive issues involved
- A good knowledge of the critical contributions on the substantive issues
- An ability to organise research material
- An ability to present a clear, convincing argument

**50-59 – equivalent to a lower second**

- A fair piece of work which demonstrates:
- A reasonable understanding of the substantive issues
- A familiarity with critical contributions on the substantive issues
- An ability to use research material to support ideas and arguments

**40-49 - equivalent to a third**

Work at this level will demonstrate:

- A general, but incomplete understanding of the substantive issues
- Some knowledge of the literature on the substantive issues
- Some ability to develop and support an argument
- A tendency to express ideas through description and anecdote rather than analysis

**39 - equivalent to a fail**

This is an unsatisfactory piece of work which demonstrates:

- Little understanding of the substantive issues and their implications
- A limited amount of reading and poor knowledge of the previous contributions on the substantive issues
- Limited ability to formulate and sustain a clear argument

**Statistical Analysis and content; descriptive, modelling, algorithms – justification of the methods used, checking of assumptions (30%)**

**Main aspects**

- Competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s)
- Substantive and in-depth interpretation of output
- Discussion on the limitations of the data and modelling and suggestions for improvement.

**70 and above - equivalent to a distinction**

An outstanding piece of work in every regard which demonstrates:

- High competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s)
- Good substantive and in-depth interpretation of output in nearly all situations
- Thorough discussion of the limitations of the data and the modelling
- Good suggestions for improvements in the design and analysis of the study being analysed

**60-69 - equivalent to an upper second**

A good piece of work which demonstrates:

- High competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s)
- An ability to make a basic level substantive and in-depth interpretation of output in most situations.
- Good discussion of the limitations of the data and the modelling and suggestions

**50-59 - equivalent to a lower second**

A fair piece of work which demonstrates:

- Moderate competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s)
- Basic level interpretation of output in most situations
- An ability to make an in-depth interpretation of output in a substantial number of situations, but not most situations
- Discussion of the limitations of the data and the modelling

**40-49 - equivalent to a third**

Work at this level will demonstrate:

- Low competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s)
- Basic level interpretation of output in a substantial number of situations, but not most situations
- An ability to make an in-depth interpretation of output in less than a substantial number of situations

**39 and below – equivalent to a fail**

This is an unsatisfactory piece of work which demonstrates:

- Very low competence in the use of appropriate statistical method(s) and software
- Basic level interpretation of output in less than a substantial number of situations
- An ability to make an in-depth interpretation of output in less than a substantial number of situations

**Presentation and communication of results; report writing, graphical and other means of data visualization, discussion of limitations and further research (30%)**

Research competencies in terms of

- Presentation (layout, structure)
- Language
- Referencing

**Oral presentation (10%)**

First class (90+)

Shows all the qualities of an 80+ presentation, but thoroughly independent, original and insightful; capable of suggesting major revisions to our understanding of the topic.

First Class (80+)

Shows all the qualities of a 70+ presentation, but showing exceptional insight, weight, and sophistication.

First Class (70+)

A sophisticated presentation that explores the methodological issues around the source material in an informed and perceptive way; enthusiastic and engaged delivery that makes the audience want to listen; uses very effective ways of conveying information, concepts and ideas; communicates difficult or abstruse ideas in a clear and intelligible way; perceptive and interesting responses in discussion.

Upper Second (60-69)

A carefully explained and clear presentation that conveys a good sense of the sources used and the methodological issues around them; clearly delivered presentation that shows an ability to engage directly with the audience; effective in conveying information, ideas and concepts to the audience; coherent and informed responses in discussion.

Lower Second (50-59)

A coherent presentation but with some omissions or lack of clarity in the presentation of concepts and ideas; relatively clear delivery conveying some ideas and information with some audience engagement; clear but basic and limited responses in discussion.

Third Class (40-49)

Little defined structure or analysis; little or inadequate preparation; poorly delivered presentation with little engagement with the audience; responses to questions were incomplete and muddled.

Failure (0-39)

Failure to carry out the task assigned; rambling and unstructured content; no preparation; poor delivery and no engagement with the audience; answers to questions were irrelevant or flippant. A mark of 0 indicates an unexplained absence from a scheduled performance.

### **Plagiarism and Collusion**

Plagiarism occurs where a student submits another person's work as though it were his/her own. All forms of plagiarism are considered serious academic offences and you will receive 0% for any work found to be plagiarised.

- (1) Students must not by implication or otherwise represent the work of others as their own, including the work of other students and material found in published, unpublished, or electronic sources.
- (2) All sources, books, articles, etc. must be explicitly acknowledged in the essay or dissertation and in the bibliography. All quotations and close paraphrases must be clearly attributed.
- (3) Students must not submit work that is identical or substantially similar for assessment in more than one course, whether in the same department, another department, or at another university.

Cases of plagiarism will be reported to the Board of Examiners and will normally result in a fail mark for a module and can result in the failure of the course as a whole.

Deliberate plagiarism is uncommon, but you may break the regulations inadvertently by failing to explicitly attribute your sources. You must avoid this by adopting a recognised referencing system used consistently in the preparation and presentation of your work.