

**School of Engineering and Built Environment  
Computing-Based UG Programmes**

**Honours Project marks**  
**Experimental style project for**  
**Honours Project MHG405293**

**Student: Robin (76%)**

**Supervisor: Gianna Cassidy**

**Second marker: Richard Foley**

**Honours year: 2012/2013**

**Date of report marking: \_26\_ / \_4\_ /13**

**Agreed summary of marks**

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	_____ 53/70 = 76% _____
Poster Presentation	mark out of 10	_____

**Total mark out of 100** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signed (Supervisor)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signed (Second Marker)** \_\_\_\_\_

## Literature review update

This section is included to allow students to gain credit for improving their literature review following feedback on the interim report. Higher marks should be awarded where there is evidence of a substantial improvement in the students review or where there is little or no change and the initial review was of high quality. In general marks for the literature review relate to the identification of key issues and & proper referencing of literature relevant to project area. A review should be a concise and critical discussion of key issues and works relevant to project area. The literature review should clearly address the identified areas of the research question which is set out in the student's Introduction Chapter of the final report.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent improvement. Student has gone beyond the comments on the original review and produced a very well integrated critical discussion with a high percentage of journal articles. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated as 1 <sup>st</sup> class <b>(in this case award the lower value 70)</b>	70-100
2.1	Good improvement. Student has taken obvious note of the comments on the original review and produced a well-integrated critical discussion with a good percentage of journal articles. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 2.1. <b>(in this case award the lower value 60)</b>	60-69
2.2	Fair improvement. Student has taken some note of the comments on the original review and produced a discussion with some critical analysis and some journal articles. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 2.2. <b>(in this case award the lower value 50)</b>	50-59
3	Poor level of improvement. Student has taken little note of the comments on the original review. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 3. <b>(in this case award the lower value 40)</b>	40-49
Fail	No improvement. Student has taken no note of the comments on the original review. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. <b>(in this case award zero)</b>	0-39

Mark awarded:   75  

### Comment:

Slight increase in sources (now 45 from 42 at Interim Report) and a better structuring of the sections of the literature review and also just the occasional touch of better clarity. Thus similar grade to Interim Report. Overall it is an excellent review of the issues directly related to his investigation and demonstrates rigour.

## ***Development of Project Methodology***

Marks relate to the clarity with which the student describes and justifies the primary research method adopted for their project; its general and detailed design, its selection of subjects/participants, configuration, materials, procedure and any associated data capture instruments, the extent to which the study could be duplicated by following the description in this section. It would be expected that the student would analyse the objectives of the project and the findings of the literature review in their discussion and presentation of the detailed methodology.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent. A very clear, complete methods section containing all relevant sub-sections. Choice of approach very well supported by references/ analysis of the problem and literature review conclusions.	70-100
2.1	Good. A clear and complete methods section containing all relevant sub-sections. Choice of approach supported by references/ analysis of the problem and literature review conclusions.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A description of the methods adopted is provided under all or most of the headings. Some justification is provided, with a degree of analysis and direct support from the students literature review..	50-59
3	Poor. While some description of the methods adopted exists it is in limited detail. Limited or no justification/analysis is provided.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Very limited or no description of the methods adopted or why they were chosen.	0-39

**Mark awarded:**      78  

### **Comment:**

The student makes an excellent case (well-supported by argument) for the evaluating techniques to be used in the experimental approach. This clearly suggests rigour. The detail of the approach is also given with very clearly justified (and supported) discussion. This is a real exemplar of the development of an experimental methodology aimed at the "Psychology" of Computer Game Design. This is just the sort of project to be commended in this particular BSc programme! The attention to detail was really excellent, demonstrating to me that in this "small-scale" study he took effective measures to ensure validity of the experiment and its results. All too often students undertaking an (HCI or similar) evaluation project just think that the methodology has a single element to it. In "real-life"/particularly post graduate level research projects a range of tools are needed. He demonstrated this very clearly with his approach to obtaining and "filtering" his population sample, his construction of the experiment activities to eliminate bias as much as was practical, with essentially all elements being justified with reference to literature/established work. This is really demonstrating the Honours level programme outcomes of the "ability to deploy techniques of analysis and enquiry within the subject". Other students take note if you want a first class!

## **Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)**

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the presentation and initial analysis/discussion of summary results in tabular, list or graphical format. The clarity of the description of the key characteristics of results.

Appropriate labelling of tables and graphs.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent. Results are very clearly and concisely laid out and well described. All key findings are highlighted and some initial discussion of their meaning in relation to the detail of the project is presented. Graphs and tables are selected intelligently and are appropriately and clearly labelled.	70-100
2.1	Good. Results are clearly and concisely laid out and well described. Key findings are highlighted with some initial discussion of them within the context of the investigation. Graphs and tables are appropriately labelled.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Results are laid out and described. Some key findings are highlighted with a degree of initial comment in relation to the context of the project investigation. Graphs and tables are labelled but not always clearly. Insufficient summarisation of data.	50-59
3	Poor. Results are not well laid out and may not be summarised. There is very little additional commentary within the context of the overall project given. Choice and presentation of tables and graphs is poor. Poor labelling.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Limited and poorly presented results and/or lack of summarisation.	0-39

**Mark awarded: \_\_70\_\_**

### **Comment:**

**At face value, a naive reader might be disappointed with the results. However what one has to remember in this type of project is that it is the application of rigour which is important. Again his presentation and discussion demonstrates that. There is an obvious rationale for the presentation of his results, he has clear and concise layout of them, with some accompanying discussion of their meaning. As I have indicated previously on a number of occasions, the answer to a "question" (and hypothesis) can be yes, no or don't know. The key issue, first and foremost, is to ensure that the research process is undertaken properly and the results are presented and discussed appropriately; and that is precisely what he has done. Obviously his statistical analysis was a straight forward one, but again it was well justified. Again, if I had this type of results discussion and presentation from all students, it would make my job a much "happier" one!**

### ***Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work:***

The marks relate to: the degree to which the student summarises and explains the outcome of their project, the degree to which they put their results in the context of what is known about the topic area; the extent to which they discuss the relevance of the results to the stated research questions/hypotheses; the extent of the critical analysis of their own work, the quality and appropriateness of the suggested areas for further study.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent. A thorough, concise and critical evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area. Good discussion about the meaning of the results in the light of the work of others. A clear and constructive critical analysis of the students own work, including the project results, but also the execution of the project methodology. The discussion clearly identifies the extent to which research questions were addressed and lays out interesting and innovative areas for further development/research. The student should set out the possible implications which aspects of their findings might have for the problem (and related) area(s).	70-100
2.1	Good. A critical evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area with reference to the work of others. A constructive critical analysis of the students own work. The discussion identifies the extent to which research questions were addressed and lays out areas for further development/research.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Some evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area with some reference to the work of others. Some critical analysis of the students own work. Some discussion of the research questions and the extent to which they were answered. Some discussion of further areas for development/research.	50-59
3	Poor. Little evaluation of the results of the project. Limited reference to what is known about the topic area and little or no reference to the work of others. Limited reference to the research questions and how they were answered. Limited critical analysis of the students own work. Limited discussion of further areas for development/research.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. No evaluation of the results of the project. Limited or no reference to what is known about the topic area and no reference to the work of others. No reference to the research questions and how they were answered. Limited or no critical analysis of the students own work. No discussion of further areas for development/research.	0-39

**Mark awarded: \_\_\_\_68\_\_\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

The basic conclusions from the results are discussed with some critical analysis and so again the student is demonstrating rigour and is "making the best of the results obtained". His project limitations/future works section is very good discussion also. He clearly understands the "constraints" of his project (since it is a small-scale one) but he takes each of these as a positive point to indicate how each could be addressed and "opened out" in order to make it that bit more "larger scale" and so turn into a project which could get more definitive results. Possibly his statistical results were limited by his underlying background but again he appreciates that and sees it very clearly as something which he would do differently and so again there is some critical analysis of his own efforts.

### ***Final Documentation:***

The marks relate to: the quality of the presentation of the report (format, discursive content, analysis and writing style); the appropriateness of the structure of the report; and the presence of the appropriate and specified sections within the report and the overall depth given in these sections.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent. Exceptionally well structured and presented report. All sections complete and appropriate.	70-100
2.1	Good. Well structured and presented report. All sections complete and appropriate.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Adequate presentation and attention to structure. All sections complete and appropriate	50-59
3	Poor. Inadequate presentation and attention to structure. One section may be incomplete or missing.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. Little attention to appearance and structure. Several sections may be incomplete or missing.	0-39

**Mark awarded: \_\_\_\_85\_\_\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

**This is really top quality, outstanding presentation. The quality of the discussion was a "real treat". All sections were complete, the overall document was really "Tidy", great attention to detail with list of figures, labelling etc. There is no reason at all why every student couldn't produce a document with this level of attention to detail, even if they don't have the underlying intellectual development to produce the academic content! Thus I always have to "wonder" why it is often only the student with that level of intellectual development who also gives me that level of attention to detail to produce a high quality presentation style in the final documentation.**

### **Supervisor only**

#### ***Student effort and self reliance***

The marks relate to: the effort that the student put into the project work; the extent to which the student needed staff support.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	Excellent. Student consistently worked above levels normally expected at honours and/or was extremely self reliant.	70-100
2.1	Good. Student worked hard on project and/or was generally self reliant	60-69
2.2	Fair. Adequate effort applied to project but student needed additional support in some areas.	50-59
3	Poor. Inadequate effort applied to project and/or student needed high levels of support.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. Appeared to make little effort and/or student needed constant support.	0-39

**Mark awarded: \_\_\_\_80\_\_\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

## Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review (update)	75	0.05	<b>3.8</b>
Development of Project Methodology.	78	0.15	<b>11.7</b>
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	70	0.2	<b>14</b>
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	68	0.15	<b>10.2</b>
Final Documentation	85	0.1	<b>8.5</b>
Student effort and self reliance	80	0.05	<b>4</b>
		0.70	Total out of 70: <b>52.2</b>

Supervisor mark (out of 70): \_\_\_\_\_

Second marker mark (out of 70): \_\_\_\_\_ **52.2** \_\_\_\_\_

Agreed mark for honours project (out of 70): \_\_\_\_\_ **53** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comment:**  
**(Necessary if there is a significant divergence of overall mark on initial marking)**