



2012 Geography

Advanced Higher Geographical Folio

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2012

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations Team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations Team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Geography

Marking Instructions

Paper 1 (Written examination)

The map interpretation question in the examination paper will be assessed using a numerical mark out of 30, the geographical methods and techniques question out of 20, and the scenario question out of 10 as specified on the examination paper. Thus the examination has a total of 60 marks available to candidates. Detailed instructions for marking the written examination paper will be sent to Markers in time for the receipt of examination papers. These instructions may be clarified or modified at the Markers' Meeting on 20 May 2012.

Paper 2 (Geographical Folio)

For the Folio, comprising a Geographical Study and a Geographical Issue, there are 4 separate key areas of assessment for each of these two elements. These are explained in the marking schemes below. Different criteria are used for the Geographical Study and the Geographical Issue. A single whole number mark out of 20 (for the Study) or 15 (for the Issue) should be awarded by the Marker for each marking criterion, according to her/his judgement of quality of the work, using the information below.

Thus for every candidate there will be three marks, one out of 30, one out of 20 and one out of 10, for the written examination. The assessment of the folio comprises four marks out of 20 for the Geographical Study and four marks out of 15 for the Geographical Issue. These should then be totalled by Markers to give **two** overall marks for each candidate – a mark out of 60 for the examination and a mark out of 140 for the Geographical Folio giving a total of 200 marks.

Exact entry of the total marks on the relevant Ex 6 form is **most important**, as this form is the basis of the data entry procedures and will be the primary element in determining candidates' final grades. These forms **must** be sent in a separate envelope to Dalkeith with the candidates' assessed work, no later than the specified date (Date to be added). All procedures are explained more fully in section III (Procedures) of this document and will be further discussed at Markers' Meetings.

General Marking Instructions

When marking the examination scripts and Geographical Folios, justify the mark awarded by comments on the flyleaf cover supplied by SQA for each of these pieces of work. No comments should be written on any part of the work itself, with the exception that standard marking devices (ticks, brackets, underlines, etc) may be used in marking the examination scripts only.

All marking issues together with consideration of each element of assessment will be discussed in detail at the Markers' Meetings. Key word descriptors are given for the specific marking criteria employed in the marking of the Folio (comprising the Geographical Study and the Geographical Issue).

Notes

1. The **general** relationship between total marks and grades awarded is shown in the table overleaf. This relationship will be moderated by the Principal Assessor and SQA Officers in light of the nature of responses to specific questions, the overall pattern of marks of candidates and evaluation of the relationship of this year's examination to benchmark standards.

Mark for whole AH programme	Literal grade relating to the mark for the whole Advanced Higher Geography programme
200 - 170	Upper A
169 - 140	Lower A
139-130	Upper B
129-120	Lower B
119-110	Upper C
109-100	Lower C
99-90	D
89 or less	No Award

2. Presentations that are over-length should be referred to the Principal Assessor as in note 5. Markers should deduct the standard penalty from the mark awarded as well as referring the work to the PA.
3. In cases of exceedingly bad spelling or lack of punctuation or illegible writing which makes the work almost unintelligible, this should be drawn to the attention of the Principal Assessor as in note 5.
4. Mark using whole numbers, using the whole range of the marks as appropriate.
5. If in so much doubt as to require a second opinion please indicate by "PA" on the **top right hand of the front cover of the examination script** or in the **top right hand corner on the flyleaf cover** supplied with the folio of submitted work.
6. Since candidates' folios may be returned to them, markers **must not** write on or otherwise annotate them. Standard marking devices (ticks, brackets, underlines, etc) may be used in marking the examination scripts, but under no circumstances should markers write any words or comments on any piece of candidate work. However comments explaining and justifying marks awarded **must** be entered on the flyleaf cover provided for each piece of work.

Specific descriptors and Marking Instructions

Mark descriptors for the Geographical Issue Essay (Folio element 1)

Assessment for the Geographical Issues Essay is focused on the following key areas:

- presentation
- research, content and relevance
- structure and logical development
- critical commentary

Choice of topic is important.

Higher quality essays generally attempt demanding topics; this should be reflected in the overall mark for this part of the folio and this is likely to be reflected in marks for the research, content and relevance and critical commentary criteria.

Essays should have an element of contextualisation in the introductory section to set the particular topic in its wider geographical setting. This should be drawn from background reading. Essays that do not have any attempt to critically evaluate sources explicitly, and are simple essays about a chosen topic are unlikely to get more than a total of 45 out of 60, as little or no mark credit can be given in the critical evaluation element of assessment. Assessment for the other three elements should be according to the quality of the work submitted without further penalty.

The essay requires a conclusion. This conclusion should make an overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the sources used for the essay. Statements of the candidate's own viewpoint are essentially irrelevant. Essays in which all sources used are of high quality, in which strengths outweigh any weaknesses are entirely acceptable provided the sources are explicitly evaluated

Candidates should be permitted considerable latitude in their choice of topic. Contemporary geography encompasses a wider range of research issues, approaches and paradigms than in the past, and candidates' choice of essay topics may reflect this. In any case of doubt contact the PA and mark the folio flyleaf cover "PA" noting choice of topic.

As well as the following introductory holistic comments and key word descriptors, guidance grids have been included to further assist the marking process.

15 – 13

<p>Very well written essays, written to a very high standard, containing a well-chosen selection of relevant material thoroughly analysed and showing well-argued and substantial critical evaluation of the sources. The essays are based on appropriate sources that give a range of viewpoints on the chosen themes. At the standard that may be at or close to being described as “little or no more could be expected at this level”.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> No more could be expected at this level; likely to include relevant illustrative graphical material that is clearly incorporated into and used in the text. A properly set out and accurate bibliography indicating that contextual research has been carried out is required.</p> <p><i>Research, content and relevance:</i> A well-chosen selection of relevant material drawn from the sources and effectively manipulated by the student. Most or all of the source material should be of intellectual substance, and supported by research contextualisation that is cited in the bibliography.</p> <p><i>Structure and logical development:</i> Very clearly organised specific arguments; thorough analysis that shows insight into the material.</p> <p><i>Critical commentary:</i> A clear, direct and explicit evaluation of the viewpoints in the sources is essential. The critical evaluation should be elegantly written, balanced and effectively incorporated into the essay structure.</p>
--	--

12 – 11

<p>Well written, containing good material, a performance with an element of merit. A clear attempt to critically assess sources is essential. Choice of themes for the essays is sound, and sources relate clearly to these themes.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors</p> <p><i>Presentation:</i> At a good standard in all respects, will include relevant illustrative material and bibliography.</p> <p><i>Research, content and relevance:</i> A selection of sound relevant material. Reasonable contextualisation.</p> <p><i>Structure and logical development:</i> Clear specific arguments, and effective analysis. Sound structure to the essay.</p> <p><i>Critical commentary:</i> A clear attempt to critically evaluate the viewpoints in the sources, with some evidence of insight into the arguments in the sources.</p>
--	--

10 – 9

<p>Workmanlike, with a tendency to focus on description of the sources, lacking insight. Often more descriptive than analytical. Some critical assessment but may be limited or largely implicit. Essay presented to a reasonable standard but may tend to focus on describing the sources. Themes and/or sources may have some deficiencies.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors <i>Presentation:</i> Generally sound though with some weaknesses, some illustrative material. <i>Research, content and relevance:</i> Largely based on relevant material, but quality of one or more of the sources is weak, thin in substance or of limited relevance. <i>Structure and logical development:</i> Detailed arguments and analysis are reasonable, though generally lacking flair. An attempt to provide an organised structure to the essay. <i>Critical commentary:</i> Some attempt to make explicit statements on the viewpoints in the sources, though text may provide an implicit review of viewpoints. Formulaic and/or with a tendency to hyperbole.</p>
---	---

8

<p>Generally descriptive essays. Essays, which are ordinary, rather than very poor. Conclusions not drawn, and generally the essay is lacking in structure and analytical substance. Themes and sources may be weak. Essays may have some significant deficiencies in presentation.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors <i>Presentation:</i> Rather basic in all respects. Lacking flair and finish. Poor spelling and/or grammar. <i>Research, content and relevance:</i> Descriptive, limited and sources may be inappropriate or poorly characterised. Not all sources need to be academically sound but an essay based largely on such is weak in this category. <i>Structure and logical development:</i> Detailed arguments and analysis are lacking in substance and or clarity, but are ordinary rather than poor. Text not effectively organised. <i>Critical commentary:</i> Weak attempt to make an explicit statement on the viewpoints in the sources, and reliance on an implicit review of viewpoints. Essentially “an essay about”, rather than a critical evaluation of viewpoints.</p>
--	---

7

<p>Factually thin, poor sources and deficient in critical evaluation and analysis. Significant errors in content or use of methods. Fragmented text. Poor presentation, which may include poorly written and spelt text.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors <i>Presentation:</i> Poor, with little or no relevant illustrative material. May have significant text errors and generally lack finish. <i>Research, content and relevance:</i> Thin content, limited review of sources. Sources are all/mainly lacking in substance. <i>Structure and logical development:</i> Limited coherence in structure. Descriptive essay lacks organisation. <i>Critical commentary:</i> Implicit at best.</p>
--	---

6

<p>Not really at the appropriate standard for this level of work. Superficial, descriptive, many errors and very poorly presented. Shows little or no understanding of what is required in respect of critical evaluation. Poor choice and use of themes. Inappropriate sources.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors <i>Presentation:</i> Very poor and with few elements which are appropriate to expected AH standard. <i>Research, content and relevance:</i> Very weak, poorly chosen and explained sources. <i>Structure and logical development:</i> Lacking clear direction. <i>Critical commentary:</i> Effectively none.</p>
---	---

5 – 0

<p>Very poor in all respects, lacking any attempt at critical evaluation, either explicit or implicit. Essay text and content ranges from very poor to abysmal. May be a “token” presentation. Shows no understanding of what is required at this level. Give some credit where this is possible, and use 0 or near 0 only when there is little or nothing to mark.</p>	<p>Key word descriptors <i>Presentation:</i> Not at AH standard in any respect. Containing many obvious errors. <i>Research, content and relevance:</i> May be very limited in scope and not at AH standard for an essay. Very poor sources. <i>Structure and logical development:</i> Unfocussed. Essay is a collection of unlinked elements with little or no structure. <i>Critical commentary:</i> No attempt. Essay is a descriptive account of a theme, and sources play little or no part in the arguments. Use lowest range of marks in this category for incomplete or “token” essays.</p>
---	--

The following grids offer further guidance on marks distribution across the key areas:

Key Area: Presentation

Marks	Written text	Graphics/Illustrations	Bibliography
5	Very well written; virtually no errors; high standard of grammar; well finished overall; shows attention to detail	Graphics and illustrations are used very appropriately; are relevant; referred to in the text; acknowledgements as necessary; do not interfere with flow of the essay; used with skill to enhance the essay	Is extensive; demonstrates very effective background reading; is accurate; provides scope for top quality contextualisation
4	Generally well written; few errors; good standard of grammar; overall sound	Most graphics and illustrations are relevant; most are referenced in the text; most are acknowledged, if necessary	Is substantial; shows evidence of good background reading; provides for reasonable contextualisation
3	May have some errors and is overall less 'fluid'	Reason for inclusion of some illustrations is unclear; may detract from the flow of the essay	Is basic and shows little reading beyond the three sources; or quality of reading beyond the sources is not very demanding
2	Very mixed standard with many errors; lacks finish	Illustrations are not used to any positive effect; may be purely for 'decoration'; are there for their own sake as opposed to enhancing the essay	Shows little real attempt to go beyond 'finding' three sources
1	Generally poor with little attention to detail	Virtually no relevant illustrations	May have no more than three basic references
0	Very poor overall; not at AH standard	No relevant illustrations	Non-existent

Key Area: Research, content and relevance

Marks	Quality of Research	Choice of Content	Relevance
5	Research is of a very high standard reflected in the quality of materials consulted; materials show intellectual substance	Very well chosen sources; appropriate sources; choice reflects a range of viewpoints; sources are clearly understood	All materials chosen are directly relevant; they provide a distinctive perspective on/to the essay topic; they reflect a clear understanding of the topic
4	Generally sound research with most materials reflecting some intellectual quality	A selection of sound, relevant material; evidence of some background contextualisation; sources are understood	Materials relate well to the main thrust of the essay; they provide a good basis for critical evaluation
3	More limited research; mainly confined to identifying sources	Most material chosen is relevant to thrust of the topic; one of the sources may be weaker or less well understood	Largely based on relevant material; may be more ordinary; may not provide variety
2	Limited research; little evidence of intellectual quality in materials consulted	Overall poorer quality; may not be academically sound; two of the sources may be weak eg with one being the candidate's own viewpoint; some of the material chosen is not fully understood	More than half the materials chosen show poor level of relevance to the essay title
1	Generally weak research; little evidence of background research; mainly of poor intellectual quality	Sources not very appropriate; eg in a well documented topic where there is a wide choice of material of good/intellectual quality and this is not chosen; much of the material appears to reflect incomplete understanding	Most of the materials chosen are less relevant than could be for the topic especially where many obvious, better quality materials are available but do not appear to have even been consulted
0	Little evidence of research	Choices are very thin and lacking substance	Unfocused

Key Area: Structure and logical development

Marks	Summary of source	Analysis of source	Structure
5	Explains specific sources in depth to give a very clear basis for analysis and critical evaluation	Very clear, thorough analysis; relevant to the objectives of the essay; shows insight into the material and the topic	The essay has a clear, effective structure; is well laid out; shows flair; is written as an essay and has very clearly organised specific arguments
4	Sources are clearly summarised	Clear specific arguments; effective analysis	The essay has a sound structure; is generally well laid out
3	Sources are summarised reasonably but lack flair	Analysis is reasonable; lacks flair; may have imbalance in quality between analysis of different sources	Reasonable structure; may lack 'fluidity' in some areas
2	Summaries are adequate but lack substance and clarity	Tending to be descriptive as opposed to analytical; lacks substance or clarity; ordinary rather than poor	Structure may be formulaic; may not allow text to 'flow'; organisation may be mixed
1	Limited review of sources	Little real analysis; mainly descriptive	Little real attempt at structure; lacks organisation
0	Brief review of sources; not at AH standard	No worthwhile analysis	Essay is a collection of unlinked elements with little or no structure; incoherent

Key Area: Critical Commentary

Marks	Explicit critical commentary (CC)	Quality of critical commentary (CC)	Conclusion
5	CC is explicit and relates to the sources, their description and analysis; very clear, direct CC; effectively incorporated into the essay structure	CC is substantial; very well/ elegantly written; well balanced; supported from other sources; shows insight and flair; well argued	Well argued conclusion; goes beyond a repetition of earlier work; shows insight into the complexities of the topic
4	Clear attempt at CC	Shows some insight into the arguments in the sources	Reasonable attempt to provide a focussed conclusion; shows understanding of the topic
3	Some attempt	Lacking the insight; may focus on CC of lots of individual words; may be a 'rant'	Fair attempt; may be more of a repeat of earlier work; shows some understanding of the topic
2	Weak attempt	Basically an "essay about" rather than what is required	Very limited attempt; not focussed; shows little understanding of the topic
1	Very limited	Very limited; may be implicit	Mainly a repeat of previous work; reflects no clear understanding of the topic
0	No real attempt	No attempt	No real attempt

Mark descriptors for the Geographical Study (Folio element 2)

Assessment for the Geographical Study is based on the following criteria:

- presentation
- data and content
- techniques
- relationships

Choice of topic is important.

Good studies generally attempt demanding topics, and this should be reflected in the overall mark for this part of the folio. The Study should focus on clearly stated research questions. The study may be based on primary or secondary data or a combination of both. Credit should be given for primary data collected in fieldwork where this has been done to a high standard. Good studies will show flair in both analysis and the commentary on results, and will be presented to a very high standard both in the written text and in graphical material. A range of relevant graphical presentation elements is essential.

As well as the following introductory holistic comments and key word descriptors, guidance grids have been included to further assist the marking process.

20 – 17

Very well written and set out, containing high **quality data content**. **Flair in analysis** using a good range of appropriate techniques. The study shows **insight** into the research questions of the study with **excellent and appropriate** use of techniques. Presentation in all dimensions of text and graphics is to the **highest standards** that could be expected at this level. At the **overall standard, which may be at, or close, to being described as** “no more could be expected at this level”.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Very high quality throughout. Error-free and well written text. Graphical and illustrative material of an exemplary standard. No more could be expected at this standard.

Data and content: High quality and appropriate quantity of data, which very clearly relate to the defined research questions, and has been carefully chosen and/or collected.

Techniques: A wide range of appropriate techniques is correctly used. Techniques focus very clearly on the research questions.

Relationships: Analysis very clearly relates to the research questions, and explains relationships involved lucidly. No more could be expected at this standard.

16 – 15

Well presented reflecting a good standard of content and not merely “pretty”. Containing good material, **well analysed** and with some focus on defined research questions but without the element of perception and insight found in the best work at this standard, yet **a performance with an element of merit. Sound** database which is sufficiently large for meaningful analysis.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Very sound in all respects, with some evidence of flair.

Data and content: Good content. Appropriate data sources for research questions and sufficient data to support a good analysis.

Techniques: A good range of techniques is employed in a sensible manner.

Techniques should be used in a way that brings out relationships from the data, as well as describing the data.

Relationships: Clear reflection on research question in the analysis of relationships. Goes beyond repetition of results of analytical techniques.

14 – 12

Workmanlike, with relevant facts but less selective and analytical, **lacking real insight.** Makes a clear attempt to analyse a **reasonable research theme**, which however may not have been fully developed. May be **more descriptive than analytical.**

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Workmanlike with little or no evidence of flair but should be sound and clearly linked to the research aims of the study. Presentation should be largely error free.

Data and content: Sound as far as it goes. May represent a reasonable amount of work but is rather formulaic. May be limited in amount, thus restricting analysis. Some data may be rather inappropriate for the research questions of the particular study.

Techniques: Workmanlike. May not be the most appropriate available. A somewhat limited range has been used and there are some obvious ways in which a wider range of techniques might have been used.

Relationships: Tends to be descriptive rather than analytical. May be lacking commentary on some important relationships.

11

Rather limited content and analysis. Tends to be **descriptive with weak analysis** of relationships and limited conclusions. **Not very effectively structured or presented**, and may contain a **significant number** of text errors and spelling mistakes. Overall **ordinary**, rather than very poor in these respects.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Rather weak, with significant errors or poor elements.

Data and content: Limited database.

Techniques: Limited. There may be poor choice or use of some techniques.

Relationships: Largely descriptive with limited analysis of relationships.

10

Very limited content and analytical techniques. **Deficient** in examination of relationships and analysis. There may be **significant errors** in content or use of methods. No real evaluation or conclusion. **Fragmented or poorly written text** with numerous errors. **Poor presentation**, which includes poorly written and spelt text and sub-standard graphical work.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Weak. Unattractive and uninformative graphically, significant text errors.

Data and content: A limited database, which may be poorly linked to study themes. Themes and objectives poorly stated.

Techniques: A limited and poorly chosen range used.

Relationships: Mainly descriptive with little real analysis.

9

Not really at the appropriate standard for this level of work. **Very limited** data content and entirely lacking analysis appropriate to the Advanced Higher Geography course. **Superficial, simplistic** and almost exclusively **descriptive**. Contains many errors and **very poorly presented**. Shows little understanding of what is required, and has **little real content** as required by the specification of the Geographical Study.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Many text errors and very poor graphics. Not really at AH standard.

Data and content: Very limited data content in all respects. Simplistic.

Techniques: Extremely limited or inappropriate. Not really at AH standard.

Relationships: Limited description with token analysis.

8 – 0

Very poor in all respects, lacking any proper database or use of analytical techniques, containing gross errors and with no explanation. The standard of presentation ranges from very poor to abysmal. May be a token presentation. **Shows no understanding of what is required for an Advanced Higher Geographical Study.** Little or no geographical **content or relevance**. Whilst it is important to give marks where this is justified, if the study is a token very low marks will be appropriate.

Key word descriptors

Presentation: Very poor to abysmal in all respects. Clearly not at AH standard.

Data and content: Little substantial content at all. Gives clear impression that not much work has been done. Not at AH standard.

Techniques: Little or no use of techniques appropriate to AH course, and not at AH standard.

Relationships: Very weakly descriptive, with no proper analysis. Not at AH standard.

The following grids offer further guidance on marks distribution across the key areas:

Key Area: Presentation

Marks	Written text	Diagrams, graphs, photographs	Maps: scale, orientation, key, location as appropriate for the map	Finish
5	Very well written with virtually no errors; high standard of grammar; well finished overall; shows attention to detail	Presented to a very high standard throughout whether on computer or by hand; of a suitable size for their relevance to the theme of the study; reflect care and attention to detail; all have purpose	All maps have scale, orientation, key, location, as appropriate, so that markers do not have to 'look for' information; are referenced in the text so that all are seen as relevant, integrated parts of the whole; any acknowledgements are clear; selection of suitable maps from websites is recognised as a skill; any hand drawn are to a high standard	The whole study reflects great care in design, layout and attention to detail; has flair; has a bibliography which is properly set out as specified at AH
4	Well written with few spelling errors; grammar of a good standard	Generally very well presented but with one or two minor weaknesses, eg in size, attention to detail	Most maps have scale, orientation, key, location but some may have minor omissions; mainly referenced in the text; a small minority may lack acknowledgements	The study reflects a good standard of care and attention to detail; shows some effort to produce a well laid out study and has a well laid out bibliography
3	More basic standard of writing with text and/or grammatical errors; may show some signs of haste	A mixture of standards with some evidence of haste or lack of finish	Some maps are of a reasonable standard but about half lack proper key and/or are less well referenced in the text so that their purpose is less clear; layout of material is less appropriate	The care and attention to detail is reasonable but shows less effort; may not have such a well laid out bibliography

Marks	Written text	Diagrams, graphs, photographs	Maps: scale, orientation, key, location as appropriate for the map	Finish
2	Poor standard of written text with many errors; lacks attention to detail	Poorer quality showing haste or lack of finish and/or lack of attention to detail; may be oversized to 'fill up' the pages	Less than half of all maps are of a reasonable standard with a majority not referenced in the text or where their purpose is unclear	There are many signs of lack of care and attention to detail; poorly laid out bibliography
1	Very poor standard of text verging towards the 'slap-dash'	Very basic work which rarely meets AH standard	Most maps are of a very basic or poor standard; generally do not meet what is expected at AH; the purpose of most is unclear	Poor overall production which shows lack of care and organisation; little or no attempt to lay out bibliography
0	Not up to AH standard at all	Most diagrams etc are of a very poor standard and certainly not suitable for AH	Virtually all maps are well below the standard expected at AH	Very poor, showing haste and/or lack of care and attention; may have token bibliography

Key Area: Data and Content

Marks	Quality of Data	Quantity of Data	How appropriate the research methods are to the study questions	Effort
5	Very high quality of data. Data may be from Primary and Secondary sources. A blend of the two will normally produce the highest quality where thorough background reading is at an appropriately high standard for AH Data very sound and suitable Data collected by a group is acknowledged	There is an appropriate quantity of data to allow effective development of the research questions and to form the basis for high quality analysis The data has been carefully chosen to allow effective analysis and relationships to be drawn	Data very clearly relates to the research questions. Methods chosen are very effective There are no obvious omissions in the data collected which are necessary to allow the research questions to be addressed. There is insight into appropriate requirements for the questions	Substantial evidence of considerable <u>personal</u> effort in collection of data. This may be seen eg in number of sites used in fieldwork; in the bibliography from number of relevant, high quality books, journals etc consulted and used Evidence that eg sites have been revisited to allow comparison may help in this category. Evidence that materials used have had time and consideration in their choice
4	High quality of data which is generally sound Group data is acknowledged	There is appropriate data for most of the research questions but selection of some may be less successful than in the best studies; makes good use of primary and secondary data where appropriate	Where group data is used there is selection to relate to the individual's research questions. Personally collected data mainly targets research questions and will allow effective analysis. Most methods are effective	Evidence of a very good degree of effort in the amount of relevant data collected
3	Reasonable quality of data. Group data may not be explicitly acknowledged but is implicit	Reasonable amount of data to be able to address the research questions	Much of the data is relevant but a few of the methods used are less effective	Reasonable effort overall but may be of mixed quality; may not have done obvious revisits to enhance data quality eg for comparison over time

Marks	Quality of Data	Quantity of Data	How appropriate the research methods are to the study questions	Effort
2	Mixed quality of data	Data limited in quantity by not having enough eg sample points	Some of the data collected is less clearly related to the study questions. Some of the methods used are less effective	Variable, with excuses or short cuts which show lack of real application
1	Basic data Group data is not acknowledged	Not really enough data to support the research questions	Formulaic approach where little real regard for 'personalisation' of study questions has been considered. Some methods used are not appropriate or there are very obvious ways which could more effectively be used	Unacknowledged but obvious group work ... 'we' used etc or Little evidence of much dedication to the task
0	Poor quality showing signs of haste	Very little really useable data	Little effective relationship to study questions apparent Most methods used are ineffective or inappropriate	Very little effort in collection and selection of data...often reflected in 'my half day's fieldwork' or excuses like 'if I had done more'

Key Area: Techniques

Marks	Range or variety used	Effectiveness of the chosen techniques	How well they are understood	How they focus on research questions
5	A wide range of analytical and graphical techniques is used. They are appropriate to the data collected AH and other sophisticated techniques are properly used Simple techniques may be best or at least most appropriate even in top quality studies	Techniques are very suitable for analysis of data Techniques very effectively bring out relationships Techniques have been well chosen to provide the most effective means of analysis for the results	All techniques are very clearly understood, reflected in accompanying text Any sophisticated techniques are properly used and bring out an understanding of the results in a more innovative way	Techniques are very well chosen to enhance the analysis of research questions or to prove/disprove the hypotheses stated There is a very clear link to the research questions
4	A good range of techniques is used in a sensible manner. Likely to include AH stats	Techniques are suitable Techniques are effective	Techniques are mainly well understood	Techniques are well chosen and relate to the research questions
3	A somewhat limited range Some obvious ways in which a wider range could have been used to enhance the study May still include some at AH	Most of the techniques are used effectively (even where they are fairly simple)	Most of the techniques used are understood	Techniques relate to the research questions but provide less focus to the original research questions or data
2	Limited use and/or choice of techniques	Less than half of the techniques are used effectively	Less than half show a clear understanding of how they relate to the results Results may have mistakes May attempt to use "difficult" techniques which are not fully understood	Techniques seem to be chosen more for 'themselves' rather than being related to the research questions or data

Marks	Range or variety used	Effectiveness of the chosen techniques	How well they are understood	How they focus on research questions
1	Extremely limited Not really at AH standard	Most techniques are not used effectively	Most of the techniques show a lack of understanding beyond the very basic Attempt to use "difficult" techniques which are not fully understood	Techniques do little to provide focus for the stated research questions or data
0	Simplistic techniques which do not reflect AH in any way	Poor choice altogether	No real understanding of techniques used	Lack any real correlation

Key Area: Relationships

Marks	Quality of analysis related to research questions	Explanation or analysis of relationships and conclusion	Appreciation of complexity of relationships	Theoretical background to analysis of relationships
5	Analysis very clearly relates to the research questions It provides real focus and depth	Relationships are explained lucidly Mature approach to explanations Conclusion is effective and not merely a repetition of analysis	Demonstrates analysis well beyond cause and effect Seeks out and attempts to explain anomalies Shows insight into relationships	Shows flair in use of background theory or other secondary research to assist analysis
4	Analysis relates to research questions but may have slightly less focus, direction or depth of a top answer	There is more explanation than pure description but quality may be less overall Conclusion is generally sound and goes some way beyond a repetition of results	Lacks the element of real perception and insight but attempts to explain anomalies and 'sees' beyond the mundane	Makes good use of background reading and/or theories to assist analysis
3	Analysis mainly relates to research questions but there may be some omissions or assumptions	Balance between description and explanation with less depth Less effective conclusion; goes little beyond the repetition of results	Makes an attempt to explain anomalies but is less insightful; may fail to 'see' some obvious links	Makes some attempt to use secondary information to assist analysis
2	Analysis shows less relationship to some of the stated questions and shows overall lack of depth	Mostly description with very limited real explanation of relationships Conclusion merely repeats earlier results	Goes little beyond cause and effect without linking aspects which could provide depth to the analysis	Makes little use of theory; what is used may not be fully understood
1	Very little attempt at analysis of some of the research questions	Limited or very weak description with no real analysis Poor/ineffective conclusion	Shows little understanding of anything beyond simplistic cause and effect	Makes virtually no use of background reading
0	Token description of results	Little real attempt No real conclusion	No understanding	What background reading?

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]