

RESEARCH ESSAY RUBRIC - EXPLANATION

Criteria	HD (High Distinction) 80% - 100%	DN (Distinction) 70% - 79%	CR (Credit) 60% – 69%	PP (Pass) 50 % - 59 %	NN (Fail) 0 % - 49 %	Score
<p>CONTENT</p> <p>WHAT is said (i.e. the quality of ideas presented and also analysed in the writer’s own voice)</p>	<p>Ideas are fully explored, substantial, logical, rational and relevant; Demonstrates outstanding knowledge of the topic; The writer’s own voice clearly expresses and appropriately controls the content, while skilfully evaluating the ideas of others</p>	<p>Ideas are successfully explored, and reasonably substantial, logical & rational; Demonstrates thorough knowledge of the topic; The writer’s own voice presents the content and evaluates the ideas of others</p>	<p>Ideas are explored in a generally logical, rational and persuasive manner; Demonstrates sufficient knowledge of the topic; The writer’s own voice presents the content and offers some evaluation of the ideas of others</p>	<p>A number of ideas are argued with a degree of logic and/or limited persuasiveness; Demonstrates basic knowledge of the topic; The writer’s own voice is not dominant and relates too infrequently to the ideas of others</p>	<p>The ideas presented are unclear, confused, narrowly focussed and/or fails to persuade; Demonstrates little or no knowledge of the topic; Inadequate or no use of the writer’s own voice</p>	/10
<p>STRUCTUE</p> <p>HOW ideas are arranged, sequenced and combined</p>	<p>All required functions of the introduction are fulfilled (background information, statement of topic and scope points); Paragraphs have strong Topic, Developing, Supporting and Concluding sentences; Cohesive devices are sufficiently and suitably used; The conclusion comprehensively sums up the ideas, re-states the topic & adds final thoughts</p>	<p>The introduction reasonably fulfils its functions; Most paragraphs have strong Topic, Developing, Supporting and Concluding sentences; Cohesive devices are generally used sufficiently and appropriately; The conclusion clearly recaps most points, re-states the topic & adds final thoughts</p>	<p>The introduction fulfils most of its functions; A minority of paragraphs may not be fully developed; Cohesive devices are sometimes under-used or repetitive; The conclusion adequately sums up the argument but either omits to re-state the topic or to add final thoughts, or does not do so effectively</p>	<p>The essay is loosely structured with some elements of paragraphs missing or poorly organised; Cohesion between or within sentences is often faulty; The conclusion is not fully functioning</p>	<p>The introduction and/or conclusion are poorly formed or missing; Paragraphs may focus on more than one main idea; Faulty cohesion interferes with the comprehension of ideas</p>	/10

<p>LANGUAGE</p> <p>HOW vocabulary, linguistic devices and the mechanics of writing are employed to communicate the message to the reader</p>	<p>Consistently displays the hallmarks of academic language (e.g. nominalisation, collocation, extended noun groups, modality, moderation); Highly accurate mechanics of writing (e.g. grammar, spelling, punctuation)</p>	<p>Frequently displays most of the hallmarks of academic language; Mechanics of writing are generally accurate with minor exceptions</p>	<p>Occasional inconsistencies in the use of academic language; Inaccuracies in the mechanics of writing may cause some difficulty for the reader</p>	<p>Inappropriate or insufficient usage of academic language; Issues of coherence occur quite frequently as a result of poor editing</p>	<p>Inappropriate register and/or difficulties expressing ideas in academic language; Grammatical, spelling, punctuation and technical issues often create confusion on the part of the reader</p>	<p>/10</p>
<p>RESEARCH</p> <p>Suitability and range of sources, as well as selection of ideas that suit the purpose</p>	<p>Relevant and in-depth reading of a range of sources is amply demonstrated; Ideas and evidence of other scholars are skilfully selected</p>	<p>Relevant reading well demonstrated, with greater range or depth desirable at times; Ideas and evidence of other scholars are relevant</p>	<p>Scope and/or focus of reading texts is sometimes limited; Supporting ideas are not always directly relevant to the topic</p>	<p>Sources are at times unsuitable or insufficiently relevant, and/or ideas from the sources may sometimes be irrelevant</p>	<p>Limited or superficial research; Generalized reference to the sources or reference to irrelevant ideas</p>	<p>/10</p>
<p>REFERENCING</p> <p>The effective paraphrasing, and accurate recording, of other writers' voices to validate and support the writer's position</p>	<p>Sustained competency in the recording of all aspects of scholars' voices; fluent & coherent paraphrasing; Harvard style citations and referencing (LOR) standards fully met</p>	<p>Occasional inaccuracies in the recording of Direct, Indirect and/or External voice; mainly fluent & coherent paraphrasing; Harvard style citations and referencing (LOR) generally accurate</p>	<p>Inconsistent, or too few/too many, references to the voices of other scholars; Paraphrasing is faulty at times; errors in citations and/or referencing occur with some frequency</p>	<p>The voices of other scholars are over/under represented; Paraphrasing does not occur often enough or is awkwardly expressed; Errors often occur in both citations and LOR</p>	<p>The voices of other scholars are dominant and inadequately/poorly paraphrased; Errors in citations and referencing are commonplace</p>	<p>/10</p>
<p>Comments:</p>						<p>Total</p> <p>/50</p>