

## Final Research Article (55% mark of the total module) Marking Scheme

### *Readability of the article - 10%*

Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional writing (at level of a published journal article). No effort required to understand the content. No typo and grammatical errors. The narrative reads exceptionally well.	Excellent writing. Very little to no effort required to understand the content. Negligible typo and grammatical errors. The narrative is excellent.	Very good writing. Some effort required to understand the content. Minor typo and grammatical errors. Mostly readable, but could benefit from minor improvements.	Good writing. Requires a lot of effort to understand content. A few typo and grammatical errors. Mostly readable, but could be improved.	Satisfactory writing. Significant effort required to understand content. Frequent typo and grammatical errors. Readable, but the narrative could be improved largely.	Unsatisfactory and poor writing. Cannot understand content. Widespread typo and grammatical errors. Poor construction of sentences.	Very poor writing. Unintelligible to the reader. Widespread typo and grammatical errors, very poor construction of sentences. Unreadable.

### *Consistency of (revised) literature review with rest of the article – 3%*

Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional connection between the review and the rest of the article. No stretched arguments or illogical connections.	Excellent connection between the review and the rest of the article. There are no stretched arguments or illogical connections.	Very good connection between the review and the rest of the article. All connections are based on facts and logical.	Good connection between the review and the rest of the article. A few connections are far stretched and/or illogical.	Satisfactory connection between the review and the rest of the article. Many connections are not obvious, far stretched and/or illogical.	Unsatisfactory connection between the review and the rest of the article. Most connections are not obvious, far stretched and/or illogical.	Unsatisfactory and no connection between the review and the rest of the article.

<b><i>Articulation of research problem, objectives, contributions, advancement to state-of-art and understanding of context – 10%</i></b>						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement of state-of-the-art are exceptional. They are well defined. Student has systematically researched and fully analysed the problem synthesising the relevant information to an exceptional standard.	The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement to state-of-the-art are excellent. They are well defined. Student has thoroughly studied the relevant sources and demonstrated a strong ability to synthesise relevant information to an excellent standard.	The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement to state-of-the-art are clearly articulated. Student has thoroughly studied the relevant sources and demonstrated a strong ability to synthesise the relevant information to a high standard.	The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement to state-of-the-art are defined. A few of the above items are tenuous or unclear. Student has a good grasp of main issues. More could be done to relate project to a wider context.	The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement to state-of-the-art are defined. Many of the above items are tenuous or unclear. Student has a general grasp of main ideas and concepts.	The research problem, objectives, contributions, and advancement to state-of-the-art are unacceptable and unclear. Superficial grasp of broad ideas and concepts.	The research problem, objectives, contributions and advancement to state-of-the-art are not defined. Little or no grasp of broad ideas and concepts.
<b><i>Quality and soundness of the scientific work – 12%</i></b>						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Overcame a significant research challenge. Solved the challenge in an exceptionally innovative and creative way. An expert will learn something new from the research. No flaws and will endure rigorous peer review.	Contributed to tackling a significant research challenge with a lot of success. An excellent attempt to solve the challenge convincingly and in an innovative way. An expert may learn something new from the research. No flaws.	Contributed to tackling a research challenge with some success. Very good attempt to solve the challenge and with some creativity and innovation. No apparent flaws.	Contributed to tackling a research challenge with very little success. There are flaws in the approach undertaken.	Work undertaken is unchallenging. Very little creativity and innovation to the work. There are many flaws in the approach undertaken.	Little value accomplished. Completely flawed.	Nothing of value accomplished. Completely flawed.

<i>Quality of experiments and observation – 10%</i>						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exemplary experimental approach and advanced experimentation carried out (at state-of-the-art). Observations made are exceptional. An expert will find something new in the observations.	Excellent experimental approach and advanced experimentation carried out (close to state-of-the-art). Observations made are excellent. An expert may find something new in the observations.	Very good experimental approach and much beyond initial experimentation stage. No weakness in observations.	Good experimental approach and beyond initial experimentation stage. There may be limited weakness in observations.	Some adherence to a scientifically acceptable approach and is still in an initial experimentation stage. Weakness in observations throughout.	Poor experimental approach and has not progressed to an initial experimentation stage.	Unacceptable standard of experimentation.
<i>Critique of own research and potential directions for future research – 5%</i>						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional discussion of limitations and countermeasures tied in with opportunities for future research.	Excellent discussion of limitations and countermeasures tied in with opportunities for future research.	Very good discussion on limitations and countermeasures tied in with opportunities for future research.	Good discussion on limitations and countermeasures tied in with opportunities for future research.	A basic discussion on limitations or future research. Attempts made to highlight potential counter measures to address limitations.	Unsatisfactory discussion on limitations or future research.	No discussion on limitations or future research.

<b>Referencing – 5%</b>						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
References are highly relevant, exceptional quality articles and of publication standard. Review is exceptionally well referenced. Consistency of references and adherence to a single format is exceptional.	Relevance of references and quality are excellent and of publication standard. Use of references is excellent in the review. Consistency of references and adherence to a single format is excellent.	Relevance of references and quality are very good. Use of references is very good, but may have missed in a few places. There are no inconsistencies in the references and adhere to a single format.	Relevance of references and quality are good. Use of reference is good, but may have missed in many places. There are no inconsistencies in the references and adhere to a single format.	Relevance of references and quality are satisfactory. Use of references is satisfactory, but missing in many places. There are a few inconsistencies in the references and do not fully adhere to a single format.	Very few references, poor bibliography and irrelevant. There are many inconsistencies in the references, if present.	No attempt to indicate source.