**Research methods project – *Mark scheme***

**Abstract** (approx. 150 words) *Must include:* aim, brief summary of sample, methods, findings (including key statistics) and conclusions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All points included in a concise, coherent manner. | *3 marks* |
| Most points included in a coherent manner. | *2 marks* |
| Some points covered or all points covered but in a muddled, lengthy style. | *1 marks* |
| Absent, incorrect or lacks detail to give reasonable summary of the project. | *0 marks* |

**Introduction** (approx. 400-700 words) *Must include*: initial introduction to general area of study, three to four previous research studies in the area, to show how your research fits into the wider theory in this area.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Well-structured initial introduction. Studies and/or theory are well chosen, explained in detail and explicitly related to the research aims. Harvard referencing used. | *4 -5 marks* |
| Slightly muddled introduction. Research is relevant to area of study and reasonably well explained. Some links made to aim of investigation. | *2 – 3 marks* |
| Poor introduction. Less than 3 previous studies discussed and/or in little detail. Implied link to aim at times. | *1 marks* |
| Research does not relate to project and/or very little detail. | *0 marks* |

**Hypothesis** *Must include*: fully operationalised experimental/alternative hypothesis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Both hypotheses are fully operationalised and direction is well chosen. | *2 marks* |
| Both hypotheses given but not fully operationalised. | *1 marks* |
| Missing one, or both hypotheses, and/or hypotheses lack detail to make them untestable or incorrect. | *0 marks* |

**Method** (approx. 300 - 500 words) *Must include:* research design choices, identification of IV, DV and potential extraneous variables, sample method used, sample size, materials and apparatus used including (examples of each should be in an appendix), procedures, ethics.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All areas mentioned in sufficient detail to allow full and easy replication of the investigation. | *4 – 5 marks* |
| Areas mentioned in some detail to allow full replication of the investigation. | *2 – 3 marks* |
| Replication of investigation is just possible, though some details are omitted. | *1 mark* |
| Replication of investigation is not possible due to absence of key aspects or materials. | *0 mark* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Full consideration of ethical issues and evidence of this in appendices. | *2 marks* |
| Some consideration of ethical issues. | *1 marks* |
| Little or no consideration of ethical issues. | *0 marks* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Study design decisions are all accurate and suit the aims of the study. | *2 marks* |
| Most study design decisions are accurate and suit the aims of the study. | *1 mark* |
| Study design decisions are largely inaccurate and/or do not suit the aims of the study. | *0 marks* |

**Results** (approx. 200 - 300 words) *Must include:* table of statistical results (including test and critical value, probability level set) graphical interpretation of results (raw data should be in appendix) full justification of statistics test chosen, description of data trends and anomalies, test value and critical value recorded, explanation of whether the null hypothesis was selected or rejected and why.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Full justification of statistics test chosen, data is well described and correct hypothesis was chosen. | *3 marks* |
| Partial justification of statistics test chosen, description of data is reasonable, correct hypothesis chosen. | *2 marks* |
| Statistics test not justified, but correct test and hypothesis chosen. | *1 mark* |
| Incorrect test used, incorrect hypothesis chosen. | *0 marks* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Appropriate fully labelled graph chosen to display data, calculations and raw data correctly in appendix. | *2 marks* |
| Graph may lack some labelling and/or accuracy. Raw data in appendix. | *1 mark* |
| Graphical interpretation absent and/or raw data missing from appendix. | *0 marks* |

**Discussion** (approx. 400 - 800 words) *Must include*: Suggested explanations for trends and anomalies, limitations of the findings, potential practical implications of the research, two ideas for future research.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detailed explanation of findings, trends and anomalies, comparison made with background research. Attempts made to explain any possible differences. Discussion made with reference to reliability and validity of findings. | *3 marks* |
| Explanation of findings, trends and anomalies, reasonable attempt made to compare and contrast findings to previous research. Discussion made some attempted references to reliability and validity of findings. | *2 marks* |
| Poor explanation of findings, trends and anomalies, Basic links to previous research. | *1 mark* |
| No attempt made to relate findings to previous research mentioned in introduction. | *0 marks* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Three specific limitations with appropriate suggested modifications given for each points. | *3 marks* |
| Some limitations with appropriate modifications suggested for each point. | *2 marks* |
| One or two general limitations e.g. small size. | *1 mark* |
| No identification of limitations of study | *0 marks* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Two research ideas given in good detail and thoughtful discussion of implications of findings. | *3 marks* |
| One or more research ideas in reasonable detail with brief comment on implications. | *2 marks* |
| Either one research idea in brief detail and/or vague comment on implications. | *1 mark* |
| No attempt made to discuss future research and/or implications of research. | *0 marks* |

**References**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Background research used fully referenced in Harvard format. | *2 mark* |
| References in acceptable form. | *1 mark* |
| No references present | *0 mark* |

**Project style**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Formal, scientific style used throughout. Appropriate sections, in appropriate order. | *2 marks* |
| Generally scientific reporting style, and coherent in nature. | *1 mark* |
| Scientific style not used (e.g. informal or first-person) and/or lacks coherent structure. | *0 marks* |