

Research Proposal Rubric

Note: 0,5 bonus points can be added to the overall grade on ONE extra aspect of **content** that exceeds the reader's expectations (e.g., mastery of theoretical concepts).

Criteria	Level 1 (max. 28 pts)	Level 2 (max. 62 pts)	Level 3 (max. 100 pts)	Score
Content and Source Use (max. 35 pts) <i>Level 1 = 7_{pts}</i> <i>Level 2 = 21_{pts}</i> <i>Level 3 = 35_{pts}</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> All required components are present but ONE section* does not meet word limit requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects limited understanding of subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills and/or ability to elaborate on or justify ideas <input type="checkbox"/> If present, arguments may often lack clarity, adequate support from literature or elaboration <input type="checkbox"/> Choice of related literature is limited (less than 12 sources used) or inappropriate (non-scholarly, irrelevant, outdated sources cited) <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of related literature (e.g., via quoting, paraphrasing, summarizing, and synthesizing strategies) is poor or inconsistent <input type="checkbox"/> Mismatches between in-text references and those in the reference list are frequent	<input type="checkbox"/> All sections meet word limit requirements, but ONE does not fully address all content requirements** <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects adequate grasp of subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable critical thinking skills yet some ideas may be irrelevant to the study's focus, conceptually flawed or ambiguous <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are generally coherent but some may lack clarity, adequate support or elaboration <input type="checkbox"/> Choice of related literature (12+ sources) is adequate but 1-3 sources may be outdated, irrelevant to the study's focus or lack credibility <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of related literature is acceptable, with 1-2 apparent inconsistencies <input type="checkbox"/> All sources are cited in the text and in the reference list but there may be some mismatches	<input type="checkbox"/> All required components are present and meet word limit requirements, and all main sections are elaborated at the required level of detail <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects mastery of subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates excellent skills of critical inquiry, analysis, and discussion. <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior and effectively supported with evidence from sources <input type="checkbox"/> Choice of related literature is appropriate (relevant, current, authoritative sources used) <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of related literature demonstrates skilled use of quoting, paraphrasing, summarizing, and synthesizing strategies <input type="checkbox"/> All sources are effectively acknowledged in the text and in the reference list	
Organization (max. 21 pts) <i>Level 1 = 9_{pts}</i> <i>Level 2 = 15_{pts}</i> <i>Level 3 = 21_{pts}</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical sequencing of information within and/or across sections is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph division is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Use of cohesive devices is minimal, repetitive or largely inaccurate	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical sequencing of information within and/or across sections may at times be faulty <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph division is not always effective <input type="checkbox"/> Some cohesive devices may be repetitive, missing or used inaccurately	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a clear and logical progression of ideas within and across all sections <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph division is coherent and effective <input type="checkbox"/> Cohesive devices are used effectively throughout	
Language and Quality of Writing (max. 30 pts) <i>Level 1 = 10_{pts}</i> <i>Level 2 = 20_{pts}</i> <i>Level 3 = 30_{pts}</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Deviations from academic style are frequent <input type="checkbox"/> Academic language shows little familiarity with international research writing norms <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous vocabulary, grammar use, syntax, punctuation, and spelling errors are apparent <input type="checkbox"/> There are very few to no instances of hedging*** where hedging is expected	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic style is appropriate, with 1-3 minor inconsistencies <input type="checkbox"/> Academic language is generally authentic but a few repetitions or inaccuracies are apparent <input type="checkbox"/> There may be a few inaccuracies in vocabulary and grammar use, syntax, punctuation, and spelling <input type="checkbox"/> Use of hedging is effective but not consistent	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic style is appropriate throughout <input type="checkbox"/> Academic language is specific to research writing, varied, and used accurately throughout <input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary, grammar use, syntax, punctuation, and spelling errors are rare and not noticeable <input type="checkbox"/> Hedging is used effectively throughout	
Format (max. 14 pts) <i>Level 1 = 2_{pts}</i> <i>Level 2 = 6_{pts}</i> <i>Level 3 = 14_{pts}</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of the proposal (headings, font, spacing, margins, indentation, bolding, etc.) largely deviates from task requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of cited sources using APA is largely inaccurate, inconsistent or flawed	<input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of the proposal is acceptable, with 1-3 apparent inconsistencies (headings, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of cited sources using APA (in-text references/reference list) is acceptable, with up to 4 apparent inconsistencies	<input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of the proposal meets all task requirements, with 1-3 minor inconsistencies <input type="checkbox"/> Formatting of cited sources using APA (in-text references/reference list) is generally effective but may require 1-3 minor revisions	

Total: _____ **Grade:** _____

***Main sections** include the **Introduction** (200-300+), **Literature Review** (800-1000+), and **Methods** (300-400+). If the Literature Review section is under length, 1 point will be deducted from the overall score.

****Main content elements** include *topic importance, background* (where necessary), *in-depth review of previous research* (using mostly scholarly sources FIVE of which should be non-Russian; a few special-interest websites are allowed where necessary), *research gap, the study's purpose and research questions, research design, justification of proposed data collection and analysis methods, and the study's scope and limitations.*

***Students are expected to use **hedging** when discussing the study's significance and implications, and interpreting their own and other scholars' ideas, views, and findings.

The Weight of the Components

The score points are per ONE box under a specific criterion/level.

Content and source use (max. 35 pts) 7 descriptors	Organization (max. 21 pts) 4 descriptors	Language & Quality of Writing (max. 30 pts) 4 descriptors	Format (max. 14 pts) 2 descriptors
<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 = 7/7 = 1 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 = 21/7 = 3 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 = 35/7 = 5 pts	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 = 9/3 = 3 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 = 15/3 = 5 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 = 21/3 = 7 pts	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 = 10/4 = 2.5 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 = 20/4 = 5 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 = 30/4 = 7.5 pts	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 = 2/2 = 1 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 = 6/2 = 3 pts <input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 = 14/2 = 7 pts

Assessment is based on the Current HSE Scale:

96 – 100% = 10; 91 – 95% = 9; 86 – 90% = 8; 78 – 85% = 7; 71 – 77% = 6; 61 – 70% = 5; 51 – 60% = 4;

36 – 50% = 3; 21 – 35% = 2; 1 – 20% = 1