WBS Postgraduate Taught Dissertation Marking Criteria July 2021

	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-100
Problem Articulation (Articulating and justifying the research problem / question(s) with clear statement of research objectives)	Underlying research problem / question(s) and research objectives not articulated.	Major gaps in the derivation and articulation of the research problem / question(s) and research objectives.	Some evidence of articulating a research problem/research question(s) but with limited explanation of its / their derivation, limited originality and limited articulation of accompanying research objectives.	Adequately derived and articulated research problem/research question(s) that show(s) some degree of originality. Some articulation of research objectives.	Good derivation and articulation of the research problem/research question(s) that show(s) a good degree of originality. Clear research objectives.	Very good derivation and articulation of the research problem/research question(s) that show(s) a high degree of originality. Very clear research objectives.	Excellent derivation and articulation of the research problem/research question(s) that show(s) a very high degree of originality. Extremely clear research objectives.	Exceptionally well-derived, clearly articulated and highly original research problem / question(s). Extremely clear research objectives.
Use of literature (Identifying relevant literature from appropriate sources and critically reviewing it)	Demonstrates hardly any awareness of relevant concepts/theories and literature and/or some serious misinterpretation of these.	Many major gaps in the coverage of relevant concepts/theories and literature and/or some serious misinterpretation of these.	Some major gaps in the coverage of relevant concepts/ theories and literature and/or some evidence of confusion about these.	Some minor gaps in the coverage of the relevant concepts/ theories and literature. Demonstrates some ability to summarise and synthesise these but with minimal evidence of critical evaluation.	Good coverage of relevant concepts/theories and literature selected from appropriate sources. Demonstrates a good ability to critically evaluate and synthesise these.	Comprehensive coverage of relevant concepts/theories and literature selected from appropriate sources. Demonstrates a very good ability to critically evaluate and synthesise these.	Comprehensive coverage of relevant concepts/theories and literature selected from appropriate sources. Demonstrates an excellent ability to critically evaluate and synthesise these.	Demonstrates use of concepts / theories and literature which exceeds expectations for this level, such that the work merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
Use of Methods (Justifying and explaining (with reference to appropriate literature) the choice of methods to collect and analyse the data/evidence and applying those methods appropriately.	Methods not presented.	Inappropriate method(s) and data/evidence analysis with minimal justification and explanation.	Weak justification and explanation of choice of method(s) and / or some issues with analysis of the data /evidence.	Adequate justification and explanation of choice of method(s) and analysis of the data/evidence.	Good justification and explanation of choice of method(s). Demonstrates good analysis of the data/evidence.	Very good justification and explanation of choice of method(s). Demonstrates very good analysis of the data /evidence.	Excellent justification and explanation of choice of method(s). Demonstrates excellent analysis of the data/evidence.	Excellent, thorough and detailed justification and explanation of choice of method(s) and excellent analysis of the data/evidence, such that the work merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
Findings (Using the data / evidence analysed to present logical findings)	Very little data/evidence presented which significantly limits the presentation of findings.	Inadequate use of data/evidence which also limits data analysis and the development of clear findings / arguments.	Links between data/evidence analysed and findings / arguments are not always clear.	Reasonable integration of the data/evidence into findings which supports most but not all of the claims made.	Good integration of the data into clearly presented findings and underlying arguments.	Very good integration of the data/evidence into clearly presented findings and underlying arguments.	Almost seamless integration of the data / evidence into clearly presented findings and underlying arguments.	Seamless integration of the data / evidence into clearly presented findings and underlying arguments, such that the work merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
Discussion & Implications (Showing capacity to critically discuss the findings in relation to the literature and their implications)	No or inadequate discussion of the findings and/or their implications for the academic field, practice and/or other key stakeholders.	Very little evidence of an ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders.	Some evidence of an ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders but with some serious shortcomings.	Some evidence of an ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders but with some shortcomings.	Demonstrates a good ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders.	Demonstrates a very good ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders.	Demonstrates an excellent ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders.	Demonstrates an exceptional ability to critically evaluate the findings and discuss their implications for the academic field, practice and/or key stakeholders in a way that exceeds expectations for this level, such that the work merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
Academic Writing (Presenting clear and structured work; academic honesty, referencing and citation)	Very poorly structured; very limited citation/referencing and significant spelling/grammar errors.	Poor structure and/or almost no use of academic writing techniques. Citation/referencing and spelling/grammar errors impede clarity of meaning.	Poor structure and/or little use of academic writing techniques. Citation/referencing and spelling/grammar errors impede clarity of meaning.	Basic structure and clear presentation; adequate use of academic writing techniques including some appropriately-cited and referenced material; minor spelling/grammar errors.	Clearly structured and presented; good use of academic writing techniques including appropriately-cited and referenced material; good spelling/grammar.	Very clearly structured and presented; very good use of academic writing techniques including appropriately-cited and referenced material; very good spelling/grammar.	Excellent structure and very well presented; excellent use of academic writing techniques including appropriately-cited and referenced material; excellent spelling/grammar.	Presents work of exceptional quality, which merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark.
	<30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-100

Note: The marking criteria are not used as a basis for calculating the final mark but instead used to provide a holistic overview of the work.
At Postgraduate level the pass mark is 50.