

Assessment Rubric for Undergraduate Academic Research Paper (ARP)

BIAM Program School of International Studies (SoIS) Universiti Utara Malaysia

Name: _____ Matric No. : _____ Semester: _____ Insert the Score Here: _____

STANDARDS CATEGORY	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weight	Total Score	LOC /MARKS
(a) Background of Study	● Strong introduction and a comprehensive background of the investigated topic. ● Articulately addresses the relevance of the topic.	● Adequate introduction and some background of the investigated topic. ● Addresses some aspects of the topic’s relevance.	● Minimal introduction and background of the investigated topic. ● Inadequately addresses the relevance of the topic.	● No relevant introduction or background of the investigated topic. ● Fails to address the relevance of the topic.	/4	6	30 LOC 2 (Cognitive) (a) + (b) + (c) + (d)+(e) = _____
	Comment:						
(b) Problem Statement	● Identifies a specific and unique problem statement that is fully appropriate to the discipline.	● Some information of problem statement that is relevant to the discipline.	● Unclear problem statement that is not entirely appropriate to the discipline.	● The problem statement is missing or not totally appropriate to the discipline.	/4	5	
	Comment:						
(c) Research Questions/ Objectives	● Clear and precise research questions and research objectives	● Provided some precise and relevant research questions and research objectives.	● Most of the research questions and research objectives are unclear or imprecise.	● Missing of clear and precise research questions and research objectives.	/4	4	
	Comment:						

(d) Literature Review	● Provides an excellent critical review of what is known about the topic, going beyond mere description. ● Reviews a diverse range of relevant literature materials. ● Clearly synthesizes and summarizes the major ideas of sources based on thematic connections. ● Clearly identifies and explains the research gap.	● Provides some critical review of what is known about the topic, with only a few sections being descriptive. ● Reviews most of the relevant literature materials. ● Synthesizes and summarizes some major ideas of sources based on thematic connections. ● Mentions the research gap, but with limited detail.	● Literature review lacks critical analysis, with many sections being purely descriptive. ● Literature sources lack diversity. ● Often unclear in synthesizing and summarizing ideas based on thematic connections. ● Provides minimal or vague information about the research gap.	● Literature review is missing or fails to review the literature in a proper academic form. ● Lacks diversity in literature sources. ● Presents an unclear or inaccurate summary and synthesis of ideas, showing poor understanding of thematic connections. ● Missing discussion of the research gap entirely.	/4	10	
	Comment:						
(e) Conceptual/ Theoretical Framework	● Concept or theory is clearly explained and well-presented, supported by a thorough review of relevant academic literature.	● Concept or theory is adequately explained and presented, supported by a sufficient review of relevant academic literature.	● Concept or theory is poorly explained or presented, supported by an underdeveloped review of relevant academic literature.	● Concept or theory is not explained, with little or no support from relevant academic literature.	/4	5	
	Comment:						

(f) Methodology	- Selected a methodology or approach that is highly appropriate for the research question and investigated topic. - Clearly and concisely explained the methodology or approach, including strong justification for its selection. - Fully and insightfully addressed the limitations of the methodology or approach.	- Selected a methodology or approach that is appropriate for the research question and investigated topic. - Adequately explained the methodology or approach with sufficient justification for its selection. - Adequately addressed the limitations of the methodology or approach.	- Selected a methodology or approach that is partially appropriate for the research question and investigated topic. - Explanation and justification for the methodology or approach are unclear or incomplete. - Addressed the limitations of the methodology or approach only superficially.	- Selected a methodology or approach that is inappropriate for the research question or investigated topic. - Provided little or no clear explanation or justification for its selection. - Did not address the limitations of the methodology or approach.	/4	10	20 LOC 3a (Practical) (f) + (g) = _____
	Comment:						
(g) Conclusion	- Provides a comprehensive review of all key research elements. - Presents a detailed and accurate summary of research findings. - Offers strong and clear recommendations for future research. - Delivers an insightful discussion on the impact of the researched material on the topic.	- Provides a moderate review of key research elements. - Presents a reasonable summary of research findings. - Offers adequate recommendations for future research. - Delivers an adequate discussion on the impact of the researched material on the topic.	- Provides only a limited review of key research elements. - Presents an inadequate or incomplete summary of research findings. - Lacks clear recommendations for future research. - Offers only minimal discussion on the impact of the researched material on the topic.	- Missing a review of key research elements. - Fails to provide a summary of research findings. - Provides no recommendations for future research. - Fails to discuss the impact of the researched material on the topic.	/4	10	
	Comment:						

(h) Results and Discussion	- Clearly communicates research results. - Thoroughly and Convincingly interprets results in light of the proposed research questions and literature review. - Information clearly and strongly relates to the main topic or subject matter with detailed discussion. The thesis comprehensively discussed the investigated subject. - Meets or exceeds the standards of scholarship in the academic discipline for this stage of scholarly development.	- Communicates most research results clearly. - Interprets most results in light of the proposed research questions and literature review. - Provides some strong Information adequately relates to the main topic or subject matter. Only a few with minimum detailed discussion. - The thesis mostly discussed the investigated subject. - Mostly meets the standards of scholarship in the academic discipline for this stage of scholarly development.	- Communicates research results with limited clarity. - Provides inadequate interpretation of results in light of the proposed research questions and literature review. - Information fairly relates to the main topic or subject matter. Many with minimum detailed discussion. - The thesis mostly failed to discuss the investigated subject. - Mostly fails to meet the standards of scholarship in the academic discipline.	- Communicates research results unclearly. - Fails to interpret results in light of the proposed research questions and literature review. - Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic or subject matter. - The thesis failed to fully discuss the investigated subject. - Does not meet the standards of scholarship in the academic discipline for this stage of scholarly development.	/4	13	35 LOC 3c (Written Communication) (h) + (i) + (j) + (k) + (l) = _____
	Comment:						
(i) Supporting Evidence	- Provides very strong arguments, all supported by solid evidence. - The written work expertly integrates ideas from different sources, synthesizing them into a highly compelling and sophisticated argument that adds depth.	- Some supporting evidences/samples are provided. - The written work effectively integrates ideas from different sources, synthesizing them into a cohesive argument that supports the author's main point.	- Offers many weak arguments with minimal supporting evidence. - The written work integrates some ideas from different sources, but the author fails to synthesize them effectively or connect them to their own argument.	- Missing or non-relevant supporting evidence/ examples - The written work fails to integrate ideas from different sources effectively to support own arguments.	/4	5	
	Comment:						

(j) Writing and Organizational	● Paragraph structures have well-phrased topic sentences, varied in length, and flow smoothly. ● Information from all sources is fully integrated. ● Ideas and discussions are logically and coherently ordered.	● Most paragraph structures have solid topic sentences. ● Information from all sources is mostly integrated. ● Ideas and discussions are generally logical, with only occasional lapses in flow.	● Many paragraph structures lack solid topic sentences. ● Information from sources is only partially integrated. ● Ideas and discussions are often disorganized or lack logical progression.	● Paragraph structures do not include solid topic sentences. ● Information from sources is not integrated. ● Ideas and discussions are disorganized and lack logical order.	/4	8	
	Comment:						
(k) Visual Aids	● All high-quality charts, figures, tables, graphs, images, etc., that significantly enhanced understanding of the interpretation (if applicable)	● Mostly good-quality charts, figures, tables, graphs, images, etc., that generally supported understanding of the interpretation (if applicable).	● Included many low-quality charts, figures, tables, graphs, images, etc., that provided limited support for understanding the interpretation (if applicable).	● Included confusing or inappropriate charts, figures, tables, graphs, images, etc., that hindered understanding of the interpretation (if applicable).	/4	4	
	Comment:						
(l) Mechanics, Grammar and Punctuation	● Free of errors in grammar, spelling, mechanics, and punctuation.	● Some errors in grammar, spelling, mechanics, and punctuation, but they do not distract from reading the thesis.	● Multiple errors in grammar, spelling, mechanics, and punctuation that distract from reading the thesis.	● Significant and repeated errors in grammar, spelling, mechanics, and punctuation.	/4	5	
	Comment:						

(m) In-text Citation	● Cited all data obtained from other reference sources. ● All references in the text used correct citation style/format. ● Adherence to appropriate style guidelines (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	● Most of the data obtained from other reference sources are cited. ● Most of the citation styles are correctly used. ● Minor errors in adhering to appropriate style guidelines (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	● Only a few data obtained from other reference sources cited in the thesis. ● Many references used either inconsistent or incorrect citation style. ● Multiple errors in adhering to appropriate style guidelines (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	● No citation in text on data obtained from other reference sources. References used in text are either inconsistent or incorrect citation style. ● No attention to appropriate style guidelines (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	/4	5	15 LOC5 (Ethics and Professionalis m) (m)+(n) + (o) = _____
	Comment:						
(n) Reference List or Bibliography	● All references in the reference list/bibliography are in the correct citation style and format.	● Most references in the reference list/bibliography follow the correct citation style and format.	● Many references in the reference list/bibliography use incorrect citation style or format.	● All references in the reference list/bibliography are in an incorrect citation style or format.	/4	5	
	Comment:						
(o) Aesthetics	● Excellent formatting and appearance using appropriate font, font size, line spacing and border areas.	● Appearance and formatting are generally good but only some elements need to be improved.	● Appearance and formatting are acceptable but a lot could be improved	● Unacceptable appearance and formatting. ● Does not use appropriate font, font size, line spacing and border areas.	/4	5	
	Comment:						

Additional Comment: _____

Supervisor/ Reviewer: _____ **Total Score:** _____

(Signature & Stamp)