

Assessment criteria: Component 4 Cambridge Research Report		
AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation		
AO1 Research		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devise and develop an appropriate research question. Design and manage own research project using appropriate research methods and methodology. Maintain and use a research log in support of the research process. 		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and challenging research question developed thoughtfully and independently by constructive dialogue, responding fully to feedback. Strong and consistent understanding of appropriate research methods. Methodology is carefully and thoughtfully considered and shows an innovative approach. The work is independently managed without over-reliance on teacher support. Highly effective and clear maintenance and use of a research log showing full support of the research process.
3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate research question developed with some independence, showing reflection and/or responding to feedback. Sound understanding of appropriate research methods. Methodology is considered. Much of the work is independently managed without over-reliance on teacher support. Effective and reasonably clear maintenance and use of a research log throughout the research process.
2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question identified which may be inappropriate but with guidance shows some ability to develop it either by reflection on its implications or by responding to feedback. Shows understanding of appropriate research methods. Some research is self-motivated and effective, but some relies on ongoing support and is not well-focused. Some effective use of a research log, but this is used inconsistently in support of the research process.
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question may be inappropriate and/or there is no serious attempt to develop it throughout the study. Shows limited understanding of appropriate research methods. Management of research lacks independence and is unfocused and ineffective. Limited and ineffective use of a research log.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation		
AO1 Analysis		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select and analyse appropriate concepts, arguments, perspectives and evidence from a range of source material. Analyse and use relevant and credible evidence in support of arguments and overall perspectives. Analyse relevant perspectives, showing awareness of how the arguments, claims and the nature of the evidence are used to support conclusions.
3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent selection and analysis of highly appropriate and sharply relevant material from a wide and challenging range of relevant sources. Strong and consistent analysis of evidence, showing innovation and depth of thought in support of arguments and overall perspectives. Well-considered and developed analysis of relevant perspectives to draw reasoned conclusions. There is a good balance between perspectives and the analysis has depth.
2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good selection and analysis of appropriate and relevant material from a range of relevant sources. Consistent and efficient analysis and use of evidence in support of arguments and overall perspectives, but some lack of depth. Consistent analysis of relevant perspectives in supporting reasoned conclusions. There may be some imbalance between perspectives and lack of depth in the analysis.
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some selection and analysis of relevant and appropriate material from relevant sources. Some analysis and use of evidence in support of arguments and/or overall perspectives. Some analysis of relevant perspectives in supporting any conclusions. There may be some description and much imbalance between perspectives.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited selection and analysis of appropriate material from a limited range of sources. Limited analysis and use of evidence. Much description of evidence or unsupported assertion. Limited analysis of relevant perspectives and little awareness of how they are used to support any conclusions. Description rather than analysis and based heavily on one relevant perspective. <p>A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</p>

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation		
AO1 Evaluation		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate specific research methods and methodology. Evaluate and synthesise evidence to draw reasoned conclusions. Evaluate and synthesise alternative perspectives and interpretations in order to make own reasoned personal judgements.
3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good evaluation of specific research methods and methodology. Evaluation and synthesis of evidence is well supported, developed and used effectively to draw reasoned conclusions. Alternative perspectives and interpretations are evaluated with a critical sense and synthesised to have impact on forming own reasoned judgements.
2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evaluation of specific research methods. Some evaluation and synthesis of evidence in order to draw reasoned conclusions. There may be overreliance on generalised comment on the origin of evidence rather than on validity of its arguments. Alternative perspectives are considered with some critical sense but have little impact on making own reasoned judgements.
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evaluation of research methods. Any evaluation/synthesis of evidence is limited, generalised and barely related to any conclusions. Limited engagement with alternative perspectives in making own judgements. Little sustained critical sense. Serious imbalance with the focus being largely on one perspective.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.

AO2 Reflection		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflect on the scope, nature and limitations of own research report and how and why own personal viewpoints of the issue/s researched may have changed during the research process. 		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflection on the scope, nature and limitations of the research is clear and cogent. Reflection shows a thoughtful and mature approach to how and why personal viewpoints may have altered during the research process.
3	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and well-considered reflection on the scope and limitations of the research. Reasoned reflection of how and why personal viewpoints may have altered is related clearly to the research process.
2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some reflection on the scope and/or limitations of the research. Reflection of how and why personal viewpoints may have altered is related to the research process.
1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited reflection on the scope of the research. Any reflection of how and why personal viewpoints may have altered lacks reference to the research process.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.
AO3 Communication		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicate clearly throughout the report using appropriate academic terms, referencing and citation techniques. Provide an oral explanation and justification of own report findings, choice and use of research methods and methodology. 		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report is very well organised and very clear to follow. Academic terms and conventions are used consistently and precisely throughout the report. Very clear and convincing explanation and justification of report findings, choice and use of research methods and methodology.
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report is well organised and clear to follow. Academic terms and conventions are used consistently and precisely throughout most of the report. Clear and convincing explanation and justification of report findings, choice and use of research methods and methodology.
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report is organised and fairly clear to follow. Academic terms and conventions are evident but are used inconsistently at times or lack precision. Some explanation and justification of report findings, choice and use of research methods.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report is limited in organisation and is unclear to follow. Academic terms and conventions may be evident but are used inconsistently and/or lack precision. Limited and unconvincing explanation and justification of report findings.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.