

**DSAW6075 – Research in Work-based Settings
Marking Criteria**

Marks	Marking Criteria
70%+	Excellent examination, demonstrating critical and occasionally original analysis of a wide range of methodological approaches, research designs, and research methods. Shows a sound ability to inter-relate concepts and ideas and to evaluate theory critically. Demonstrates excellent ability to critically analyse, interpret, and evaluate data with precision and accuracy, making strong links to the wider theoretical context. Excellent evaluation of ethical issues and insider research. Makes points clearly and precisely, using a range of source materials which are relevant and appropriately referenced. Excellent knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory and practice of discipline with some originality. Very good intellectual skills. Excellent management of learning, with degree of autonomy and research. Structured and creative expression. Very good practical, professional and problem-solving skills.
60 - 69%	Very good examination, evidencing sound knowledge and critical analysis of a range of methodological approaches, research designs, and research methods. Demonstrates very good ability to analyse, interpret, and evaluate data accurately, making some links and connections to the wider theoretical context. Very good evaluation of ethical issues and insider research. Points are made clearly, using source materials which are relevant and appropriately referenced. Very good knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory and practice of discipline. Some originality evidenced. Good intellectual skills. Very good management of learning, with consistent self-directed research. Structured and accurate expression. Good practical, professional and problem solving skills.
50 – 59%	Good examination, evidencing knowledge and analysis of some methodological approaches, research designs, and research methods. Demonstrates good ability to analyse, interpret, and evaluate data with some accuracy, but makes limited or widely descriptive links to theory. Good evaluation of ethical issues and insider research. Points are made acceptably, and some references are included with limited errors. Good knowledge base that supports some analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory and practice of discipline. An acceptable level of intellectual skills. Good management of learning. Some autonomy in research but inconsistent. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Satisfactory practical, professional and problem-solving skills.

40 – 49%	Shows some evidence of examination, evidencing basic knowledge and limited analysis of some methodological approaches, research designs, and research methods. Demonstrates some ability to analyse, interpret, and evaluate data with some accuracy, but with some omissions at the level of theory. Limited and/or descriptive evaluation of ethical issues and insider research. There are limitations or weaknesses in making coherent arguments, and references are occasionally improper and/or of limited relevance to the discussion. Basic knowledge base with some omissions at the level of theoretical issues. Some difficulties with intellectual skills. Restricted ability to discuss theory and/or or solve problems. Basic use of learning resources with little autonomy. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy of expression, but some evidence of developing practical, professional and problem-solving skills.
0 – 39% (Fail)	Reflection/discussion is generally at a very low level, being essentially descriptive rather than evaluative or yields neither substantive conclusions nor recommendations. Very insubstantial with serious deficiencies, for example, some components have been omitted or treated cursorily. Insufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding and/or engagement with the subject related to the specific learning outcomes of the module. No understanding of different approaches related to a wider context or within a work-based setting. No focus on relevant aspects and little or no coherence. Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of discipline. Unable to discuss theory or solve problems in discipline. Inadequate use of learning resources. No ability to direct own learning and failure to contribute. Major problems with structure and accuracy of expression. Very weak practical and professional skills. No work submitted.