|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Analytic Rubric for a Research Paper in the Humanities** | | | | |
| **Attribute** | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Unacceptable (1)** |
| **Introduction** | Strong introduction of topic’s key question(s), and terms;  Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed;  Specific thesis statement. | Conveys topic and key question(s);  Delineates subtopics to be reviewed;  General thesis statement. | Conveys topic, but not key question(s);  Describes subtopics to be reviewed;  General thesis statement. | Does not adequately convey topic;  Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed;  Lack an adequate thesis statement. |
| **Focus & Sequencing** | All material clearly related to subtopics and main topic;  Strong organization and integration of material within subtopics;  Strong transitions linking subtopics and main topic. | All material related to subtopics and main topic;  Logically organized within subtopics;  Varied transitions linking subtopics and main topic. | Most material related to subtopics and main topic;  Material may not be organized within subtopics;  Attempts to provide variety of transitions. | Little evidence material is logically organized into a main topic or subtopics;  Many transitions are unclear or nonexistent. |
| **Support** | Strong peer-reviewed research-based support for thesis. | Sources well selected to provide some support for thesis. | Sources are generally acceptable but not peer-reviewed research-based evidence. | Few insignificant or unsubstantiated sources supporting thesis. |
| **Conclusion** | Strong review of key conclusions;  Strong integration with thesis statement;  Insightful discussion of impact of the researched material on topic. | Good review of key conclusions;  Good integration with thesis statement;  Discusses impact of researched material on topic. | Review of key conclusions;  Some integration with thesis statement;  Some discussion of impact of researched material on topic. | Does not summarize evidence with respect to thesis statement;  Does not discuss the impact of researched material on topic. |
| **Grammar & Mechanics** | The paper is free of grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors. | Grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors are rare and do not detract from the paper. | Very few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors interfering with reading paper. | Grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors substantially detract from the paper. |
| **Communication** | Scholarly style;  Writing flow is easy to follow. | Scholarly style;  Writing has minimal awkward or unclear passages. | Word choice occasionally portrays an informal tone;  Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages. | Work choice is informal in tone;  Writing is choppy, with many awkward or unclear passages. |
| **Citations & Reference** | All references and citations are correctly written and present no errors in MLA style. | Rare errors in MLA style that do not detract from the paper. | Errors in MLA style are noticeable. | Reference and citation errors significantly detract from paper. |
| (Adapted from the University of Kentucky, as cited in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Guide to using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning: <https://oira.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/297/2017/07/Developing-and-Using-Rubrics.pdf>) | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Developmental Rubric for a Paper in the Social and Behavioral Sciences** | | | | | |
| **Attribute** | **Exemplary** | **Accomplished** | **Developing** | **Beginning** | **Unacceptable** |
| **Focus** | * Relevant research is thoroughly and completely discussed; * Key concepts are identified and operationally defined; * Objective stance maintained throughout document. | * Relevant research is adequately addressed; * Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined; * Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus; * Objective stance mostly maintained. | * Paper addresses the relevant research generally satisfactorily, though explanations and elaborations may be imprecise; * Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined, though the definitions may be imprecise; * Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus; * Objectively mostly maintained, though occasional subjective remarks occur. | * Paper does not adequately address the relevant research; * Very few key concepts are identified and clearly defined; * Paper contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from focus; * Frequent subjective intrusions. | * Relevant research not discussed; * Key concepts either not identified or are identified in a confusing manner; * Contains irrelevant information; * Very frequent subjective remarks. |
| **Organization & Development** | * Organization and development of content is logical and well-developed; * Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are clearly formulated and articulated; * Conclusion is fully and clearly articulated. | * Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors; * Content ad central ideas are developed; * Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are adequately formulated and articulated; * Conclusion is adequately and clearly articulated. | * Organization of content is adequate; * Content not well developed; * Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are stated, but may lack precision and clarity; * Conclusion is stated but lacks precision and clarity. | * Organization and development of content is insufficient; * Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end; * Conclusion is poorly stated and is faulty; * Paper has many problems with structure. | * Organization and development of content are lacking; * Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are not stated and may only become evident at the end; * Conclusion is not stated; * Paper has no logic and paragraphs are random and lack explanation. |
| **Style** | * Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length; * Objective and efficient academic language. | * Frequently varied sentence structure and length with rare style or structure errors; * Mostly objective and efficient academic language. | * Occasional variation in sentence structure and length; * Generally, pragmatically adequate, though some informal style may appear. | * No variation in sentence structure – very simple syntax, short and simple sentences; * Style frequently pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language. | * No variation in sentence structure – very simple and frequently erroneous syntax; * Very short sentences; * Style mostly pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language. |
| **Research** | * Flawless APA format and document design; * Unfailingly correct in-text citations; * Flawless reference section; * Complete absence of plagiarism. | * Mostly appropriate APA section headings and subheadings; * Infrequent errors in in-text citations; * Occasional errors in reference section; * Complete absence of plagiarism. | * Some lapses in APA conformity; * Some errors in in-text citations and in reference section; * Complete absence of plagiarism. | * Frequent lapses in APA conformity; * Frequent errors in in-text citations and in reference section; * Complete absence of plagiarism. | * Paper mostly APA inconsistent; * Widespread errors in-text citations and in reference section; * Evidence of plagiarism. |
| (Adapted from Texas A&M University as cited in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Guide to using Rubrics to Assess Student Learning: <https://oira.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/297/2017/07/Developing-and-Using-Rubrics.pdf>) | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Analytic Rubric for Thesis in Linguistics** | | | | |
| **Attribute** | **High Pass**  **(4)** | **Pass**  **(3)** | **Low Pass**  **(2)** | **Fail**  **(1)** |
| **Statement of the Problem** | * Very well written; * Articulates a concise and interesting hypothesis about a significant empirical linguistic problem and its broad significance. | * Clearly written; * Presents an interesting hypothesis and describes its importance. | * Provides a general discussion of the hypothesis and relevant issues but does not discuss its broader significance. | * Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem; * Poorly written, incomplete, and lacks structure. |
| **Grounding in the Literature** | * Places the work within a larger context; * Appropriately integrates relevant material; * Shows deep understanding of the significance of the research. | * Provides a meaningful summary of the literature and builds a case for the research. | * Cites most of the key literature; * Lacks critical analysis and synthesis. | * Fails to cite important, relevant literature; * Does not clearly relate the literature to the student’s contribution; * Misinterprets the literature. |
| **Methods and Data Sources** | * Uses original or creative use of linguistic analysis methods; * Data are novel and appropriate for the study. | * Uses existing linguistic analysis methodology well; * Data are appropriate to the study design. | * Demonstrates competent use of existing methods; * Collected data allow an adequate test of the hypothesis. | * Uses incorrect methodology; * Data are not handled appropriately. |
| **Results** | * Meaningful results obtained from sophisticated data analysis; * Analyses map back to the hypotheses; * Discusses the limitations of the analysis. | * Well executed; * Shows good understanding of the analytical methods; * Provides good arguments for or against the hypotheses. | * Analyses are executed correctly, but additional analyses may have yielded further insights. | * Mis-analysis data or fails to analyze relevant data; * Results do not follow from the analysis and mistakes are made in interpretation. |
| **Discussion/ Conclusion** | * Places the study in a larger theoretical context; * Informs our understanding of the nature language. | * States what was done and identifies its significance and limitations. | * Summarizes and repeats what was found; * Does not discuss the significance or limitations of the research. | * Insufficient or incoherent discussion of results; * Shows lack of understanding of linguistic theories. |
| **Overall** | * Original and significant. | * Informative, clearly written, and well-organized. | * Demonstrates competence. | * Poorly written; does not understanding basic concepts. |
| (Adapted from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kansas: <https://linguistics.ku.edu/sites/linguistics.ku.edu/files/docs/Linguistics%20PHD%20Form%20D.pdf)> | | | | |