

## Analytic Rubric for a Research Paper in the Humanities

Attribute	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Acceptable (2)	Unacceptable (1)
<b>Introduction</b>	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.
<b>Focus &amp; Sequencing</b>	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.
<b>Support</b>	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	Sources are generally acceptable but not peer-reviewed research-based evidence.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.
<b>Conclusion</b>	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.
<b>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</b>	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.
<b>Communication</b>	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.
<b>Citations &amp; Reference</b>	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
<b>Focus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant research is thoroughly and completely discussed;</li> <li>Key concepts are identified and operationally defined;</li> <li>Objective stance maintained throughout document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant research is adequately addressed;</li> <li>Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined;</li> <li>Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus;</li> <li>Objective stance mostly maintained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper addresses the relevant research generally satisfactorily, though explanations and elaborations may be imprecise;</li> <li>Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined, though the definitions may be imprecise;</li> <li>Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus;</li> <li>Objectively mostly maintained, though occasional subjective remarks occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper does not adequately address the relevant research;</li> <li>Very few key concepts are identified and clearly defined;</li> <li>Paper contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from focus;</li> <li>Frequent subjective intrusions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant research not discussed;</li> <li>Key concepts either not identified or are identified in a confusing manner;</li> <li>Contains irrelevant information;</li> <li>Very frequent subjective remarks.</li> </ul>
<b>Organization &amp; Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization and development of content is logical and well-developed;</li> <li>Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are clearly formulated and articulated;</li> <li>Conclusion is fully and clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors;</li> <li>Content and central ideas are developed;</li> <li>Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are adequately formulated and articulated;</li> <li>Conclusion is adequately and clearly articulated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization of content is adequate;</li> <li>Content not well developed;</li> <li>Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are stated, but may lack precision and clarity;</li> <li>Conclusion is stated but lacks precision and clarity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization and development of content is insufficient;</li> <li>Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end;</li> <li>Conclusion is poorly stated and is faulty;</li> <li>Paper has many problems with structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization and development of content are lacking;</li> <li>Hypotheses/Aims/ Objectives are not stated and may only become evident at the end;</li> <li>Conclusion is not stated;</li> <li>Paper has no logic and paragraphs are random and lack explanation.</li> </ul>
<b>Style</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length;</li> <li>Objective and efficient academic language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequently varied sentence structure and length with rare style or structure errors;</li> <li>Mostly objective and efficient academic language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occasional variation in sentence structure and length;</li> <li>Generally, pragmatically adequate, though some informal style may appear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No variation in sentence structure – very simple syntax, short and simple sentences;</li> <li>Style frequently pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No variation in sentence structure – very simple and frequently erroneous syntax;</li> <li>Very short sentences;</li> <li>Style mostly pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language.</li> </ul>
<b>Research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flawless APA format and document design;</li> <li>Unfailingly correct in-text citations;</li> <li>Flawless reference section;</li> <li>Complete absence of plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly appropriate APA section headings and subheadings;</li> <li>Infrequent errors in in-text citations;</li> <li>Occasional errors in reference section;</li> <li>Complete absence of plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some lapses in APA conformity;</li> <li>Some errors in in-text citations and in reference section;</li> <li>Complete absence of plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent lapses in APA conformity;</li> <li>Frequent errors in in-text citations and in reference section;</li> <li>Complete absence of plagiarism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper mostly APA inconsistent;</li> <li>Widespread errors in-text citations and in reference section;</li> <li>Evidence of plagiarism.</li> </ul>

(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)
<b>Statement of the Problem</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very well written;</li> <li>• Articulates a concise and interesting hypothesis about a significant empirical linguistic problem and its broad significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly written;</li> <li>• Presents an interesting hypothesis and describes its importance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a general discussion of the hypothesis and relevant issues but does not discuss its broader significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem;</li> <li>• Poorly written, incomplete, and lacks structure.</li> </ul>
<b>Grounding in the Literature</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places the work within a larger context;</li> <li>• Appropriately integrates relevant material;</li> <li>• Shows deep understanding of the significance of the research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a meaningful summary of the literature and builds a case for the research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cites most of the key literature;</li> <li>• Lacks critical analysis and synthesis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to cite important, relevant literature;</li> <li>• Does not clearly relate the literature to the student's contribution;</li> <li>• Misinterprets the literature.</li> </ul>
<b>Methods and Data Sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses original or creative use of linguistic analysis methods;</li> <li>• Data are novel and appropriate for the study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses existing linguistic analysis methodology well;</li> <li>• Data are appropriate to the study design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates competent use of existing methods;</li> <li>• Collected data allow an adequate test of the hypothesis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses incorrect methodology;</li> <li>• Data are not handled appropriately.</li> </ul>
<b>Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaningful results obtained from sophisticated data analysis;</li> <li>• Analyses map back to the hypotheses;</li> <li>• Discusses the limitations of the analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well executed;</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the analytical methods;</li> <li>• Provides good arguments for or against the hypotheses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses are executed correctly, but additional analyses may have yielded further insights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mis-analysis data or fails to analyze relevant data;</li> <li>• Results do not follow from the analysis and mistakes are made in interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion/ Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places the study in a larger theoretical context;</li> <li>• Informs our understanding of the nature language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States what was done and identifies its significance and limitations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarizes and repeats what was found;</li> <li>• Does not discuss the significance or limitations of the research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient or incoherent discussion of results;</li> <li>• Shows lack of understanding of linguistic theories.</li> </ul>
<b>Overall</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original and significant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informative, clearly written, and well-organized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates competence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly written; does not understanding basic concepts.</li> </ul>

(Adapted from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kansas: <https://linguistics.ku.edu/sites/linguistics.ku.edu/files/docs/Linguistics%20PHD%20Form%20D.pdf>)