



ESLG College

USE OF RUBRICS FOR STUDENTS ASSESMENT

RUBRICS OF ESSAY SEMINAR WORKS ASSESMENT WITHIN THE COURSE

	Excellent (10)	Very good (9)	Good (8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Introduction	Strong introduction to the main questions and terms of the topic. Outlines clearly the sub-topics which shall be reviewed. Statement of research problem is clear.	Follows adequately the main topic and questions. Underlines properly the subtopics which shall be reviewed. Adequate statement of the problem.	Follows the topic and key questions. Underlines clearly the subtopics which shall be reviewed. General statement of the problem.	Follows the topic but not the main question. Describes the subtopics which shall be reviewed. General statement of the problem.	Follows poorly the topic but and deviates from the main question. Describes poorly the subtopics which shall be reviewed. Poor statement of the problem.	Does not adequately follow the topic. Does not describe the subtopics which shall be reviewed. Misses the problem statement.	
Focus and sequences	All material are clearly related to the main topic and sub-topics. Strong organization and	All material is adequately related to the sub-topic, main topic and properly	All material is clearly related to the sub-topic, the main topic and is logically	Most of the material is related to the sub-topic and the main topic.	A large part of the material is not related to the main sub-topic and topic.	Very little material is logically organized into topics, subtopics, or related topics.	

	<p>integration of the reviewed material within the sub-topics. Strong transitions and connecting bridges in writing that connect the subtopics with the main topic.</p>	<p>organized within the relevant subtopics Transitions and appropriate connecting bridges in writing that connect the subtopics with the main topic.</p>	<p>organized within the respective sub-topics Transitions and clear connecting bridges in writing that connect the subtopics with the main topic.</p>	<p>The material cannot be organized into sub-topics. Medium effort to provide transitions and connecting bridges in writing that connect the sub-topics to the main topic.</p>	<p>The material can not be organized in subtopics at all. Poor attempt to provide transitions and connecting bridges in writing that connects subtopics to the main topic.</p>	<p>Many transitions and connecting bridges are unclear and non-existent.</p>	
Theoretical support	<p>Strong research from peer to peer journal articles to support the topic.</p>	<p>Very well selected resources to support the topic and problem with research conducted adequately in supporting the topic and research problem.</p>	<p>Resources are selected well to support the topic and problem with medium research in supporting the topic and research problem.</p>	<p>Moderately acceptable sources, however, do not come from peer to peer scientific journal research that contain the empirical evidences.</p>	<p>Sources are acceptable and none of the peer-to-peer scientific journal research contains empirical evidences</p>	<p>Very few sources that support the topic. Sources are irrelevant or unfounded</p>	
Conclusions	<p>Strong review of conclusions. Strong integration with the problem statement. Detailed discussion of the impact of the researched material</p>	<p>Strong review of conclusions.Strong integration with the problem statement. Proper discussion of the researched</p>	<p>Strong review of conclusions Strong integration with the problem statement. Medium discussion of the</p>	<p>Medium review of conclusions. Integration to some extent with the statement of topic and problem.</p>	<p>Poor review of conclusions. Poor integration with the topic and problem statement. Extremely poor discussion of the</p>	<p>Does not summarize the evidence at all in terms of topic and problem. Does not discuss at all the impact of the</p>	

	on the selected topic.	material on the selected topic.	researched material on the selected topic.	Weaker discussion of the researched material on the selected topic.	research material on the selected topic.	research on the selected topic.	
Grammar and mechanics	Research paper is free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation mistakes.	Grammatical and spelling and punctuation mistakes are very rare.	Grammatical and spelling and punctuation mistakes are very rare.	Medium grammatical, spelling, and punctuation mistakes that interfere with the fluent reading of the topic.	Many average grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors that interfere with the fluent reading of the topic.	Substantial grammatical, spelling and punctuation mistakes that make the paper unreadable.	
Communication	Scientific style. The writing is fluent and easy to follow .	Scientific style. The writing has minimal unclear paragraphs.	Scientific style. The writing has minimal unclear paragraphs.	The formulation of sentences is informal in some cases regarding the tone of the sentences used. The writing has unclear paragraphs from time to time.	The formulation of sentences is often informal regarding the formulations used. The writing has unclear paragraphs.	The formulation of sentences is informal at all time regarding the tone used. Writing is an unrelated part among paragraphs with many unclear and unacceptable paragraphs.	
Citations and references	All references and citations are written correctly and without any mistake, respectively according to the regulation of UBT College.	Very rare mistakes in citation style that do not comply with the rules of the UBT College.	Very rare mistakes in citation style that do not comply with the rules of UBT College.	Mistakes in citations are obvious.	Mistakes in citations are clear, obvious and more pronounced.	Mistakes in citations are so frequent that they make the paper to fail and make it to completely deviate from the main topic.	

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

RUBRICS OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH WORKS ASSESMENT WITHIN THE COURSE

	Excellent (10)	Very good (9)	Good (8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant research discussed fully and in details. Key concepts identified and defined. Objective attitude performed throughout the entire document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant research adequately treated. Most of the concepts are identified and defined. Contains some irrelevant informations, but does not deviate from the focus of the topic. Objective attitude performed most of the time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research paper treats the research question generally in a satisfactory manner, although the explanations and elaborations may be inaccurate. Most of the key concepts identified and defined, although the definitions may not be accurate. Contains some irrelevant information but does not deviate significantly from the focus of the research. Objective attitude saved in most of the cases, even though subjective remarks occur from time to time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research paper does not adequately treats the relevant research. Only a few key concepts identified and defined clearly. The paper contains a lot of irrelevant information's and deviates seriously from the focus of the topic. Frequent interference of subjective expressions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research paper regulates the relevant research in poor manner . Very few key concepts identified and defined clearly. The paper contains too much irrelevant information's and the focus is extremely weak. Subjective expressions prevail over the objective attitudes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant research is not discussed. Key concepts are not identified or are confusedly identified Contains irrelevant information and almost has no focus. Very frequent remarks of subjective expressions 	
Organization and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization and development of the content is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization and development of the content is adequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization and development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization and developmen 	

development	<p>development of the content is logical and developed very well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypotheses / goals / objectives are clearly formulated and articulated. The conclusions are fully and clearly articulated. 	<p>logical with minimal mistakes. Content and central ideas are developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypotheses / goals / objectives are adequately formulated and articulated. The conclusions are adequately and clearly articulated 	<p>The content not well developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypotheses / goals / objectives are stated but they lack accuracy and clarity. The conclusions are stated, but they lack accuracy and clarity. 	<p>development of the content is average.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The content has the developed shortcomings. Hypotheses / goals / objectives are poorly stated and they notably lack accuracy and clarity. The conclusions are weak, inaccurate and unclear. 	<p>of the content is insufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content not developed at all. Hypotheses / goals / objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end of the paper The conclusions are poorly stated but also erroneous The paper has many structural problems 	<p>t lack completely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content and ideas are not developed at all. Hypotheses / goals / objectives are not stated and do not become evident until the end. The conclusions are not stated at all. The paper has no logic and the paragraphs are unrelated and lack the complete explanatory element. 	
Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure of sentences sophisticated and varied.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diverse structure with structural mistakes and of a very rare style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasional variations in the structure and length of the sentences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variations are rarer in the structure and length of sentences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No variation in sentence structure - linguistic syntax is simple and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No variation in language structure - very simple syntax and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective and efficient academic language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Languages is objective and academically efficient in most of the cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general the language is adequate, although from time to time an informal style of writing is presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language begins to become weaker and the informal style of writing becomes more common. 	<p>sentences are short and simple.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language style is inadequate with a large excess of informal language. 	<p>very often with mistakes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very short sentences. Language style is extremely inadequate with a very large excess of informal language.. 	
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design without any mistakes. Theoretical framework without any mistakes and strongly supported. Research methodology exact and elaborated without any mistakes, including research instrument, sample and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design without any mistakes. Theoretical framework without any mistakes and strongly supported, but with some very rare mistakes in citations. Research methodology exact and elaborated without any mistakes. Minor mistakes in the sample, research instrument and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design with minor mistakes in the conformity between the theoretical framework, method, sample, research instrument and data processing method. Theoretical framework with mistakes in citations and in support by the authors. Research methodology appropriate, but in some places not in full compliance with the theoretical framework, research instrument, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design with minor mistakes in the conformity between the theoretical framework, method, sample, research instrument and data processing method. Theoretical framework with often mistakes in citations and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design with major mistakes in the conformity between the theoretical framework, method, sample, research instrument and data processing method Theoretical framework with major mistakes in citations and in support by the authors. Appropriate research methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design inconsistent Theoretical framework does not support research design . Research methodology not in compliance with theoretical framework and research question. Results completely 	

	<p>research protocol.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results coherently structured without any mistakes and easily readable. • Not found any paragraph that is not quoted. 	<p>research protocol.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results coherently structured without or very minor mistakes. • Not found any paragraph that is not quoted. 	<p>sample and research instrument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results coherently structured with average mistakes in terms of their elaboration and interpretation. • Not found any paragraph that is not quoted. 	<p>in support by the authors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methodology appropriate, but in some places not in full compliance with the theoretical framework, research instrument, sample and research instrument. • Results coherently structured with often mistakes in terms of their elaboration and interpretation • Not found any paragraph that is not quoted. 	<p>but in some places not in full compliance with the theoretical framework, research instrument, sample and research instrument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results coherently structured with often mistakes in terms of their elaboration and interpretation. • Many paragraph unquoted. 	<p>unstructured.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visible evidence of plagiarism. 	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

RUBRICS OF EXAMS ASSESMENT WITH ESSAY QUESTIONS

Criteria and points	Excellent (10)	Very Good (9)	Good(8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Relevance of the answer to the raised essay question	The answer is complete; sufficient details to provide support for findings; The answer focuses on issues related to the question; correct answer in terms of facts and theory.	The answer is complete, enough details in the findings but with minor mistakes; The answer focuses on questions related to questions but with few deviations; correct answer in terms of facts and theory;	The answer is incomplete, insufficient details in the findings but with more pronounced mistakes; The answer focuses on issues related to questions but with more pronounced deviations; correct answer in terms of facts and theory but with deviations from time to time;	The answer is short and with insufficient details. Unrelated aspects are inserted and with minor mistakes in a given short content.	The answer is incomplete. Excessive discussion of unrelated issues and with major mistakes in the brief content provided.	The essay does not fit the question.	
Detail of answer	Addresses fully the question.	Treats the question in detail with some minor generalizations .	Treats the question in detail with generalizations.	Most of the basic details are included but some are missing.	Serious gaps in the basic details needed.	None of the relevant details are included.	
Organization and logic of response	Excellent presentation of the answer with strong arguments. The transitions are very clear;	Presentation of the answer with strongly good arguments; Clear transitions but with very few mistakes.	The presentation of the answer is an excellent, but arguments in some rare parts are missing. Good transitions but .in some parts missing.	Clear and logical presentation; medium argument of development strength; The transitions from one sentence to another are clear and easy.	Minor problems of organization or logic; There is a need to create transitions between ideas .	Poor organization; the sentences are confusing; ideas are repeated.	

Mechanic of writing (spelling, punctuation, grammar and clarity)	High academic style of expression	Academic style of expression but with very minor spelling mistakes.	Academic style of expression but with rare grammar mistakes and very minor spelling mistakes.	Clear, Readable. Good use of language transitions. There are not many problems in spelling, punctuation or language.	Frequent problems with linguistic mechanics; Occasional sentences that are confusing and have weak transitions; poor readability.	Major problems in linguistic mechanics; Poor construction of sentences; Weak transitions that are completely missing ; Too often sentences are not understood at all.	
--	-----------------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	--

RUBRICS OF PRESENTATION ASSESMENT

Category	Criteria of Assesment	Total Points	Grade
Organisation (15 points)	Type of presentation is appropriate for the topic and audience .	5	
	The informations are presented in logical sequence.	5	
	Presentation adequately cites the appropriate number of references.	5	
Content (45 points)	Introduction attracts attention, presents the problem appropriately, and determines framework appropriately for the rest of presentation.	5	
	The technical terms are properly defined for the target audience.	10	
	The presentation contains accurate information.	10	

	Material included is relevant to the overall message / purpose.	10	
	Proper amount of material is prepared and the points raised are properly reflected in terms of their relative importance.	10	
Presentation(40 points)	Speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience and is properly animated (with gestures, movements).	5	
	Speaker uses clear and loud voice.	5	
	Presentation is controlled and fluent.	5	
	Good language skills and beautiful diction.	5	
	Visual aids are very well prepared, informative, effective and do not deviate from focus.	5	
	Size of the presentation is within the time limits.	5	
	Informations are properly communicated.	10	
Results	Total points	100	

RUBRICS OF TAKE HOME EXAM ASSESMENT WITH OPEN ANALITICAL QUESTIONS

Criters and points	Excellent (10)	Very Good (9)	Good(8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Organizati on of thoughts	Excellently organized and very easy to derive the logic of thoughts	Very good organized and very easy to derive the logic of thoughts.	Good organized and very easy to derive the logic of thoughts.	Good organized and relatively easy to follow the logic.	The ideas are somewhat disorganized and difficult to follow the logic .	Ideas very disorganized and very difficult to follow the logic.	
Quality of writting	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of an excellent quality	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of a very good quality..	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of a good quality.	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of a medium quality.	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of a poor quality.	Sentence and structure of paragraphs of a very poor quality.	

	Rules and formatization and citation rules followed.	Rules and formatization and citation rules followed.	Rules and formatization and citation rules followed	Rules and formatization and citation rules followed.	Some of the rules of formatization and citation not followed enough	Rules of formatization and citation not followed at all.	
Content accuracy	All concepts are correct;	Minimal concepts are incorrect	A few concepts are incorrect	More than a few concepts are incorrect	Numerous concepts are incorrect	Substantial number of concepts are incorrect	
Interconnection to theory	Interconnection of analysis with theoretical concepts exceeds expectations.	Interconnection of analysis with theoretical concepts meets expectations.	Interconnection of analysis with theoretical concepts meets expectations, but there are some minimal mistakes.	Interconnection of analysis with theoretical concepts has medium mistakes.	Interconnection of analysis with theoretical concepts has substantial deficiencies.	There is no interconnectedness at all. Analysis is more subjective self-opinion unsupported by theory .	
Quality of scientific support	Scientific support of an excellent quality that include peer to peer publications.	Scientific support of a very good quality that include peer to peer publications.	Scientific support of a good quality that include peer to peer publications.	Scientific support of a medium quality that include peer to peer publications.	Scientific support of a low quality that include peer to peer publications.	Scientific support of a very low quality that include peer to peer publications .	

RUBRICS OF HOMEWORK ASSESMENT WITH INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP CASE STUDIES

Criteria and points	Excellent (10)	Very Good (9)	Good(8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Identificatio n of the main problems and aspects.	Identifies and understands excellently all key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect)	Identifies and understands all the main aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	Identifies and understands most of the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect)	Identifies and understands most of the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect)	Identifies some of the main aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect), but does not fully understand what it identifies.	Identifies and understands little bit the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect)	
Analysis of issues raised in the case study	Very smart and detailed analysis of all issues raised in the case study.	Detailed analysis of all issues raised in the case study.	Detailed analysis of most of the issues raised in the case study .	Analysis of the most issues raised in the case study, but in a superficial form.	Analysis of most of the issues raised in the case study, but in a superficial form.	Incomplete analysis of issues.	
Comments on effective solutions (proposed by the student or group or which are found hidden in case study)	Documented and reasoned excellently the solutions to the problems raised in the case study.	Documented and reasoned solutions in very good form to the problems raised in the case study .	Appropriate and well thought out solutions to the most of the problems raised in the case study.	Appropriate but not sufficiently justified solutions to some of the problems raised in the case study.	Superficial and inappropriate solutions to some of the problems raised in the case study .	Inadequate solutions provided to most of the problems raised in the case study.	
Relation to the course	Excellent research of	Very good research of issues	Research and well-documented	Research and superficially	Research and documented	Research and insufficient	

readings and additional research.	issues raised in the case study with clear and well-documented connection in an excellent way to the course and external readings .	raised in the case study with clear and well-documented connection in an excellent way to the course and external readings.	connection to the course readings and external readings.	documented connections to the course readings and external readings.	connection in a limited way to the course readings and external readings.	connection to the course readings and external readings.	
-----------------------------------	---	---	--	--	---	--	--

RUBRIC OF PROJECT REPORT ASSESMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITY

Criteria and points	Excellent (10)	Very Good (9)	Good(8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Identificaton of the main problems and aspects.	Identifies and understands excellently all key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	Identifies and understands all key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	Identifies and understands most of the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	Identifies and understands some of the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	Identifies and understands some of the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect), but those that identifies does not fully understand.	Identifies and understands very little the key aspects raised in the case study (direct and indirect).	
Analysis of the issues raised in the case study .	Very smart and detailed analysis of all issues raised in the case study.	Detailed analysis of all issues raised in the case study.	Detailed analysis of the most issues raised in the case study.	Analysis of most of the issues raised in the case study, but in a superficial form.	Analysis of some of the issues raised in the case of the study but in a superficial form.	Incomplete analysis of issues.	

Presence of interdisciplinary component.	Meaningful and effective connection to the various disciplines hidden in the case study.	Effective connection to the most of the disciplines hidden in the case study	Superficial connection to the most of the disciplines hidden in the case study.	Explores the connections with the various disciplines hidden in the case study.	Limited connections to the various disciplines hidden in the case study.	No connection to the various disciplines hidden in the case study.	
Comments on effective solutions (proposed by the student or group or which are found hidden in case of study)	Solutions documented and reasoned excellently to the problems raised in the case study .	Solutions documented and reasoned very good to the problems raised in the case study .	Appropriate and well thought out solutions to most of the problems raised in the case study .	Appropriate solutions but not sufficiently justified to some of the problems raised in the case study.	Superficial and inappropriate solutions to some of the problems raised in the case of study.	Improper solutions provided to most of the problems raised in the case study.	
Relation to course readings and additional research	Excellent research of issues raised in the case study with clear and well-documented connections to the scourse and external readings.	Very good research of issues raised in the case study with clear and well-documented connections to the course and external readings.	Research and well-documented connection to the course readings and external readings.	Research and documented connections in superficial form to the course readings and external readings.	Research and documented connections in limited way to the course readings and external readings	Research and insufficient connection to the course readings and external readings.	

RUBRICS OF FILM DEBATE ASSESMENT

Criteria	Assesment	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents accurate and relevant informations. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declares clear attitudes. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizes and presents ideas in a logical form. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines the introductory statement of the debate in logical form. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents arguments and ideas convincingly. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaks with clear voice and presents himself well. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make eye contact with it's own team, opposing team and public. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connects relevant arguments with theory. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adheres to debate rules (e.g., time, adheres to moderator instructions) 	5 6 7 8 9 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates cooperatively with other members of the team. 	5 6 7 8 9 10	

RUBRIC OF DIPLOMA THESIS ASSESMENT

Criteria and points	Excellent (10)	Very Good (9)	Good(8)	Acceptable (7)	Poor (6)	Fails (5)	Points
Abstract	<p>Clear and concise.</p> <p>Declares the problem, finding, methodology and importance.</p>	<p>Organized very well .</p> <p>Declares the problem, finding, methodology and importance.</p>	<p>Organized well.</p> <p>Declares the problem, finding, methodology and importance.</p>	<p>Abstract has introduction in findings.</p> <p>Statement of problem, findings, methodology and relevance may need more.</p>	<p>Introduction to problem definition and findings is lacking or not clearly developed.</p> <p>The findings, methodology and relevance of the study are not well organized.</p>	<p>Introduction to problem definition and findings is completely lacking.</p> <p>The findings, methodology and relevance of the study are lacking. The abstract is completely structured differently.</p>	
Research question and hypotheses	<p>The research question and hypotheses are original and very important in terms of their potential to critically address the relevant issue.</p>	<p>The research question and hypotheses are original and important in terms of the potential to critically address the relevant problem.</p>	<p>The research question and hypotheses are original and clear in their contribution to science.</p>	<p>The research question may be original but the relevance to the relevant field is not well supported.</p>	<p>The research question needs for more structuring and development.</p>	<p>The research question and hypotheses are completely formulated incorrectly and are completely unrelated.</p>	

Literature Review	<p>Possession and creative and critical engagement with relevant literature in this field.</p> <p>Demonstrates the gap in the relevant literature and makes a very convincing argument that the research will address the gap.</p>	<p>Possession and critical engagement with relevant literature in this field.</p> <p>Demonstrates the gap in the relevant literature and makes a very convincing argument that the research will address the gap</p>	<p>A wise summary that integrates relevant literature.</p> <p>Demonstrates that student can use the literature to discuss scientific trends, to develop hypotheses, and to identify gaps in the literature that will address the student research.</p>	<p>Provides an analysis of previous findings.</p> <p>Adequate coverage of relevant literature, but weak link to research question.</p>	<p>The literature review is incomplete and does not include some of the important references related to the field and course of the study.</p> <p>The relevance of the literature presented for the research question is unclear.</p>	<p>Literature review has nothing to do with the research question and in many parts is also unrelated to each other..</p>	
Research method and approach	<p>Research method, research instrument, research design and samples are selected in an excellent way and are maximally related to the research question.</p>	<p>Research method, research instrument, research design and samples are selected in a very good way and are maximally related to the research question.</p>	<p>Research method, research instrument, research design and samples are selected in a good way and are maximally related to the research question.</p>	<p>Research methods, research instrument, research design and samples have weaknesses .</p>	<p>Research methods, research instrument, research design and samples have obvious weaknesses.</p>	<p>Research methods, research instrument, research design and samples have very pronounced weaknesses.</p>	
Results and their interpretation.	<p>The analysis of results is very rigorous.</p> <p>The findings are related to the</p>	<p>The analysis of results is rigorous.</p> <p>The findings are related to the</p>	<p>The analysis of results is well correlated with the research question and theoretical framework.</p>	<p>The analysis has a weak connection with the theory.</p> <p>The findings are not addressed in detail.</p>	<p>The analysis is not completed</p> <p>The findings are not supported by the</p>	<p>The analysis is very limited</p> <p>The section of discussions is</p>	

	<p>research question and theoretical basis .</p> <p>Rigorous discussion of findings of this study with previous research conducted by other authors.</p>	<p>research question and theoretical basis.</p> <p>Discussion of findings of this study with previous research conducted by other authors is adequately conducted.</p>	<p>The findings are properly addressed.</p>		<p>section of discussions</p>	<p>completely missing.</p>	
Findings	<p>Provides a discussion focused on conclusions, placing them in the literature.</p> <p>Advances the field and raises new questions. Makes a convincing and interesting argument related to the importance of their findings.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate discussion of the conclusions.</p> <p>Advances the field and raises new questions. Makes a convincing and interesting argument related to the importance of their findings.</p>	<p>The conclusions are well presented and insightful.</p> <p>Presents a convincing argument on how their study addresses a gap in the literature.</p>	<p>Summarizes the results and provides a general discussion about the literature.</p> <p>There is a limited discussion of the gap in the literature that addresses their study.</p>	<p>The summary of results is unclear or missing.</p> <p>The link between findings and data may not be convincingly placed.</p> <p>Little or no interpretation is given or the interpretation may not fit with findings.</p>	<p>The summary of results is extremely short and poor</p>	