| **Mid Thesis (100%)** | **Distinction** | | **Merit** | **Pass** | **Fail** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **9 - 10** | **7- 8** | **6** | **5** | **3 - 4** | **0 – 2** |
| **(C1) General structure, formatting, and Layout (10%)** | A very good report have been produced showing no deficiencies in the organisation. The work will be of a professional standard. | A report have been produced of a good structure containing suitable sections and pleasing referencing. | A reasonable report have been produced with all required sections. In areas, there will be minor deficiencies such as layout or poor referencing. | The created report is weak in its presentation. Sections required will be present but not addressed at a suitable level. | The report is very poor in presentation with its construction lacking elements of the report (e.g. unsuitable structuring). | The written document does not adequately represent a report. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9 - 10** | **7- 8** | **6** | **5** | **3 - 4** | **0 – 2** |
| **(C2) Grammar and Spelling, Writing Style (10%)** | Excellent and professional writing, few grammatical or spelling mistakes. | Clear and consistent writing, with few grammatical or spelling errors. | Generally good writing, some errors, inconsistent spellings. | Writing is not very good, but still understandable, with some errors and inconsisten­cies. | Poor, grammar sometimes makes meaning difficult to in­terpret, Inconsistent spelling, or grammar. | Falls far below the standard for submission and is frequently difficult to follow. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **17 - 20** | **14- 16** | **12 - 13** | **10 – 11** | **5 - 9** | **0 – 4** |
| **(C3) Introduction (20%)** | Outstanding formulation of a problem, research questions, aim, objectives, justification of the project. | Good formulation of the problem, with all components and enough details, but there are some minor deficiencies in the chapter. | Chapter 1 is written well, but few components are not appropriate. Most components are clear and can be understood. | Satisfactory problem formulation and the project can be understood and justified, but there are some major deficiencies in some components. | Fails to identify and justify the problem, aim and objectives, but there are some efforts to formulate the problem and describe the project aim and objectives. | Very week problem formulation, and there are major deficiencies in most parts of chapter 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **17 - 20** | **14- 16** | **12 - 13** | **10 – 11** | **5 - 9** | **0 – 4** |
| **(C4) Literature Review (20%)** | Outstanding evidence of wide and deep systematic review using multiple searches, multiple databases. | Very careful reviewing, systematic combinations of search terms, with minor deficiencies. | Evidence of reviewing and using appropriate approaches, but the scope is not enough wide and deep. | Incomplete and not systematic, but adequate to identify a part of the literature. | Fails to sufficiently identify the literature to yield an informative review. | Little or no evidence of a systematic approach, incomplete review. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **17 - 20** | **14- 16** | **12 - 13** | **10 – 11** | **5 - 9** | **0 – 4** |
| **(C5) Research Methods (20%)** | The creative and highly appropriate methodology is clearly articulated and justified. | The methodology is well-argued and justified. | The methodology is explained and appropriate for the project. | An appropriate methodology is broadly outlined, but details are not always clear | The methodology is either not appropriate for the project or is poorly articulated suggesting deficits in understanding. | Missing methodology part or not relevant information is given. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9 - 10** | **7- 8** | **6** | **5** | **3 - 4** | **0 – 2** |
| **(C7) Focus and clarity of argument (10%)** | The research innovation/ invention has global implications to a new body of knowledge, practise and future research | The research innovation/ invention has national implications to a new body of knowledge, practise and future research | The research innovation/ invention has local implications to a new body of knowledge, practise and future research. | The research innovation/ invention has societal implications to the body of knowledge, practise and future research. | The research innovation/ invention has limited implications to the body of knowledge, practise and future research. | The research innovation/ invention has no implications to the body of knowledge, practise and future research. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9 - 10** | **7- 8** | **6** | **5** | **3 - 4** | **0 – 2** |
| **(C7) Citation & references (10%)** | There is full, accurate, and professional citations of very recent sources and reliable references with correct for­mat. | Sources are generally cited correctly, the majority of references are recent and reliable, and format is mostly correct. | Citations are mostly done, and references are up to date, but there are some outdated and non-reliable sources, suitable format. | References and citations are acceptable, but lack of high quality and professional sources, acceptable format with some mistakes. | Inadequate citations of sources, outdated and unre­liable references, poor for­mat with many mistakes. | Very poor citations, refer­ences, and format. |