

AFM 102
Group Research Project Marking Guide & Marker's Comments

1. Overview of the topic:	
Definition of concept	/4
Explanation of role in organizations:	/4
Discussion of topic importance	<u>/2</u>
	<u>/10</u>

Maker's Comments:

- This section was generally well done.
- Overview requirements were specified in the course outline.

2. Practitioner article(s):	
Explanation of purpose of the studies	/5
Discussion of the study's content	/10
Articles clearly & appropriately identified as "applied"	/5
Extensiveness of research	<u>/10</u>
	<u>/30</u>

Marker's Comments:

- Main weaknesses included not clearly identifying the purpose/focus of the studies (i.e., what did the study examine?) and not clearly identifying the study as practitioner in nature. The need to do both of these was mentioned several times in class for both presentations and projects.
- The mark for "extensiveness of research" was based on the number of practitioner articles discussed/summarized. There was no maximum specified in the course outline. Marks ranged from 6 (1 article summarized) to 10 (4 or more summarized). This range (and the related mark) was not pre-determined but instead was based on the actual numbers of articles summarized by the 45 groups that completed the project.

3. Academic article(s):	
Explanation of purpose of the studies	/5
Discussion of the study's content	/10
Articles clearly & appropriately identified as "academic"	/5
Extensiveness of research	<u>/10</u>
	<u>/30</u>

Marker's Comments:

- Main weaknesses included not clearly identifying the purpose/focus of the studies (i.e., what did it examine? What were the research questions?) and not clearly identifying the study as academic in nature. The need to do both of these was mentioned several times in class for both presentations and projects.
- The mark for "extensiveness of research" was based on the number of academic articles discussed/summarized. The maximum number of articles to be reviewed was set at 3 per the course outline and groups who did the maximum received 10. Groups that discussed

1 article received 7 while groups that discussed two received 8. The marks were not pre-determined but instead were based on the actual numbers of articles summarized by the 45 groups that completed the project.

4. Summary of key learning points: /10

Marker's Comments:

- A summary of the key points learned from the group's research (practitioner and academic) was a specific requirement per the course outline (the "final component").
- There was high variance in the quality of groups' attempts to fulfill this requirement. On average, groups tended to discuss their findings in terms that were quite general instead of identifying specific points learned from their studies.

5. Quality of writing (grammar, sentence structure, spelling) /10

Marker's Comments:

- Many reports would have benefited from a thorough proof reading and it was obvious that too much reliance had been placed on "spell-check" as a means for detecting errors.
- The goal should be 0 defects.

6. Quality of report organization (section headings, tables/graphs) /5

Marker's Comments:

- This aspect of the reports was generally well done with the best reports reflecting a consistent approach to formatting each section. Some groups did not appear to have attempted to standardize the report in terms of the layout of the various sections. Some sections had multiple sub-headings while others had none. A group report should not look like the result of cutting and pasting three (or more) individual pieces together.

7. Acknowledgement of source material (references & bibliography) /5

Marker's Comments:

- Some groups did an excellent job of properly acknowledging ("citing") their sources of information in the body of the report (either footnotes or APA style citations).
- Other groups only prepared a bibliography but did not acknowledge their sources in the body of the report (see preceding bullet point). If you weren't sure what "cross referencing all sources of information" (see course outline) meant it would have been a good idea to ask!
- Direct quotes must be cited with a specific page number reference.