# Rubrics gebruikt bij HRD Theory 4 Practice (consists of Part A-F)

Maaike Endedijk

Evidence based: artikel overrubrics Jonsson & Svingby, 2007

These rubrics are used for the formative and summative assessment of your paper. In case your paper exceeds the word limit with more than 500 words, serious writing problems emerge or evidence of plagiarism is found (see asterisk \* in the rubrics), the paper will not be graded. For some criteria “if applicable” is added, meaning that for some topics or reviews this criterion may be less relevant.

**A General structure, language, and formatting**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Structure of the paper | The paper lacks direction, with subtopics appearing disjointed. The paper has no organization, with no logical sequencing or structure. No tables or figures are used when needed or they are used in a non-clarifying way. | The paper has weak organization, ineffective transitions and does not flow from point to point. Not all sections or paragraphs follow in a natural or logical order. Transitions between paragraphs or sections are often lacking. Tables or figures (if applicable) are used in a non-clarifying way. | There is a basic flow from one section to the next, paragraphs are in a logical order, although transitions between paragraphs or sections are not always clear. The use of tables and figures (if applicable) can be improved by making them more concise and insightful.  | The paper is written with a coherent, clear structure that supports the review. Transitions tie sections together, as well as adjacent paragraphs.Tables and figures (if applicable) are used and referred to in an appropriate way. |
| 2 Writing | It is difficult to understand what the author is trying to express. Misspelled words, incorrect grammar, and improper punctuation are evident.These errors make comprehension almost impossible\*. | Frequent spelling errors are made or incorrect grammar is used. Writing style is vague or unfocused and therefore the author’s message is unclear. Paragraphs often lack a good focus. | Writing is generally clear, but unnecessary words are often used. The author’s message is sometimes not completely clear. Paragraphs have a good focus, but the structure of sentences is often too repetitive. Minor spelling and grammar errors are made.  | Writing is clear, effective and insightful. Paragraphs are well structured and are focused. Free of spelling or grammar mistakes. Smooth flow and effective transitions within paragraphs. |
| 3 APA | Does not use APA format. Citations for statements included in the report were not present, or references which were included were not found in the text.Style and format standards are not applied. Sources are plagiarized\*.  | Reflects incomplete knowledge of APA format. Inconsistent style and format. Lacks precision in use of quotations and citation of sources. Citations in the body of the paper do often not correspond with the reference list. | Uses APA format with minor violations. Citations within the body of the paper and a corresponding reference list were presented. Some formatting problems exist, or components are missing. Few errors of style and format. Most are sources documented correctly. | Uses APA format accurately and consistently. All needed citations were included in the paper. References matched the citations, and all were encoded in APA format. Style and formatstandards are consistently applied. |

**B Introduction**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Problem definition | Poor description of topic and field. The author demonstrates an inadequate knowledge base to understand the significance or scope of the problem. No references are made to recent developments in HRD. | Topic is introduced, but the author does not distinguish what has and has not been studied before. Topic is not positioned in broader scientific literature. Recent developments in HRD are only discussed on a very general level. | The reader is made aware of the overall problem, challenge, or topic of the review. The paper includes some discussion of broader scientific literature. General developments in the HRD field relevant to the topic are described, making use of scientific or non-scientific sources. | The author critically examines the state of the field. The author describes what has and has not been studied. Furthermore, the topic is well positioned in more general and topic-related developments in the field of HRD as described in scientific and non-scientific sources. |
| 2 Conceptual understanding | There are conceptual misunderstandings and definitions of key concepts are missing. The author refers to sources that appear minimally or only generally relevant to defining the proposed research question. Scientific terminology is limited.  | Basic definitions of the key concepts and existing theories are given. However, the choice of the definitions and theories does not match the topic. The author cites sources both relevant and irrelevant to the problem and research questions. The author uses scientific terminology, but does not always make appropriate choices in terms that are used.  | Key concepts are defined and relationships among key variables and phenomena are described. The author discusses and compares relevant theories. Only sources that are relevant to the research question are cited. The author demonstrates adequate understanding of the scope and significance of the problem and uses scientific terminology.  | The author critically discusses the definitions and relationships among key variables and contradictions in the existing theories. Only sources that are relevant to the research question are cited. In the paper a thorough understanding of the scope, significance, and conceptual basis of the problem is demonstrated and scientific terminology is used appropriately. |
| 3 Research Question | Research question is not related to the literature as described in the introduction or the research question is missing. | Weakly states how the cited literature contributes to or justifies posing the research question. The research question is lacking a clear structure. | Research question is clearly stated, but the author provides not enough relevant sources to justify this specific question. | Author uses the cited literature to justify the proposed research as a logical next step. Research question is clearly stated. |

**C Method**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Search & selection of literature | The method section displays no evidence of systematic or sufficient search. Information is gathered from fewer than 5 sources, or also secondary sources[[1]](#footnote-1)# are included.The author makes a poor selection of the final included literature. Hardly any reputable sources are included. | The method section displays evidence of a basic search in a single database, without an explanation for this choice. A few well selected materials are included, but the author also leans on non-scientific sources. Information is gathered from more than 5 primary sources[[2]](#footnote-2)#, but some of them are not relevant to the topic. | The method section displays evidence of a broad search and consistent use of databases. In case of the use of only one database, explanations for this choice are included. The selection includes scientific sources, such as peer-reviewed articles. Information is gathered from more than 5 primary sources[[3]](#footnote-3)#, all of them are relevant to the topic. | The method section displays evidence of a comprehensive and systematic search and selection of material. There is a wide and systematic use of databases. Additional search methods (if applicable) are described. The selection includes scientific sources, such as peer-reviewed articles and includes all important sources. Information is gathered from more than 5 primary sources[[4]](#footnote-4)#, all of them directly relevant to the topic. |
| 2 Description of method | Only some general search terms are mentioned. It is not clear which search terms have been used in which databases. The author does not discuss the criteria for inclusion or exclusion. | The specific search terms and search combinations in relation to the databases are described.The author discusses some of the reasons for included and excluded literature. However, it remains unclear how the final selection has been made. | The author describes specific search terms and search combinations in relation to the databases. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sources are described and how these criteria were used to narrow down the selection in different steps. | The author describes specific search terms and search combinations in relation to the databases. Inclusion and exclusion of literature are mentioned, including justifications for these choices and how these criteria were used to narrow down the selection in different steps.  |

**D Result section**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Organization | The result section appears to have no direction; there is no logical order in which the literature has been discussed. The author presents an annotated bibliography without clearly demonstrating the links among cited sources. No tables or figures are used when needed or they are used in a non-clarifying way. | The literature is discussed in a specific order; however, the choice for the way of presenting the results is not convincingly explained. The result section is organized as an enumeration of results in which a certain direction is missing. Tables or figures (if applicable) are used in a non-clarifying way. | The structure of the result section supports the review and is in line with the research question. The links between the cited sources are often demonstrated, but sometimes missing. The use of tables and figures (if applicable) can be improved by making them more concise and insightful. | The structure of the result section supports the review and is in line with the research question. The links between the cited sources are clearly demonstrated. The different paragraphs are smoothly connected to each other. Tables and figures (if applicable) are used and referred to in an appropriate way. |
| 2 Synthesis, analysis and evaluation | The author fails to present any synthesis of the cited literature. The review doesn’t demonstrate an accurate understanding of the sources. The author vaguely describes positions on issues but does not emphasize similarities or differences.  | The paper demonstrates an insufficient review of the literature. The author does not analyze the sources effectively or uses the critiques of others. Sources are mainly summarized, resulting in a superficial synthesis of the literature cited. The review demonstrates that sources were read, but level of understanding was partial or inaccurate.  | The paper demonstrates an accomplished review of the literature. The paper presents an effective synthesis of the literature cited. The author describes positions on issues, revealing their similarities and differences. The review demonstrates that sources were read and the main messages of the sources are well understood. | The paper demonstrates an accomplished review of the literature. The paper presents an insightful and thorough synthesis, analysis and evaluation of the literature cited. The author concisely summarizes contrasting positions, differences and similarities in a critical way. |

**E Conclusion and discussion**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Conclusion | There is no indication that the author tried to formulate a conclusion based on the literature under review. No answer to the research question is provided. | The author provides concluding remarks, but these are not fully supported by the literature under review. The conclusions are described are either too general or too specific. | The author provides concluding remarks that show an analysis and synthesis of ideas. Some of the conclusions, however, were not supported in the review.  | The author formulates conclusions that are to the point. Conclusions show an analysis and synthesis of ideas and are strongly supported in the review. |
| 2 Discussion | There is no evidence of having insights in the limitations of the study. The implications for theory and practice are not connected to the results of the review: they are not related to existing theories or current development. No specific directions for further research are given. | The limitations of the study are not specifically described. The paper incompletely describes the theoretical implications of research findings in the cited literature. Implications for practice are described only in terms of “more attention should be given”, but specific suggestions for practice are lacking. Directions for further research are barely connected to the results of the review. | The author demonstrates good insight in the limitations of the review study. S/he understands the practical and theoretical implications of research findings. Both the practical and scholarly significance of the review are clearly described. Directions for further research are well described on a general level but do not connect to the specific conclusions from the results of the review. | The author has good insights in the limitations of the review study. Both the practical and theoretical significance of the review are clearly described and critiqued. Demonstrates thorough understanding of the theoretical implications of research findings. Suggestions for theory and practice are strongly supported throughout the review. Directions for further research are specifically described and connected to the review. |

F **The summary and length of the paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| 1 Summary | The summary is missing, or does not cover all parts of the paper. The summary exceeds the maximum amount of words of 150. | The summary covers most important parts, but the summary cannot be understood without reading the paper. The summary stays within the word limit of 150 words. | The summary makes the readers aware of the overall problem, aim or research question, method and conclusions, but depth of summary is lacking. The summary stays within the word limit of 150 words. | The summary makes the readers aware of the overall problem, aim or research question, method and conclusions in a fluent way. The summary mirrors the main argument of the paper. The summary stays within the word limit of 150 words. |
| 2 Word limit | Exceeds the word limit of 2000-2500 words (excluding summary, reference list, figures and tables) with more than 500 words\*. | Stays within 500 words of the word limit of 2000-2500 words (excluding summary, reference list, figures and tables). | Stays within 250 words of the word limit of 2000-2500 words (excluding summary, reference list, figures and tables). | Stays within the word limit of 2000-2500 words (excluding summary, reference list, figures and tables). |

# Assessment form literature review paper HRD Theory 4 Practice

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable  | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent | Points received | Comments |
| A1 Structure | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| A2 Writing | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| A3 APA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| B1 Introduction: Problem definition | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| B2 Introduction: Conceptual understanding | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| B3 Introduction: RQ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| C1 Method: Search & selection of literature | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| C2 Method: Description of method | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| D1 Result section: Organization | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| D2 Result section: Synthesis, analysis and evaluation | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| E1 Conclusion | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| E2 Discussion | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |  |  |
| F1 Summary | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| F2 Word limit | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Bonus (standard) | 7 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total points |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Grade (total/7) |  |  |

**General comments**:

# Wijzigingen rubrics na feedback studenten

**Introduction**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing / not acceptable | Weak | Appropriate | Excellent |
| Problem definition | Poor analysis of topic and field. Demonstrates inadequate knowledge base to understand the significance or scope of the problem. No references are made to the recent developments in the HRD. | Topic is introduced, but the author does not distinguish what has and has not been studied before. Topic is not placed in broader scientific literature. Recent developments in the HRD field are only discussed on a very general level. | The reader is made aware of the overall problem, challenge, or topic of the paper. Some discussion of broader scientific literature. General developments in the HRD field relevant to the topic are described, making use of scientific or non-scientific sources. | The author critically examines the state of the field. It is discussed what has and has not been studied. Furthermore, the topic is well positioned in more general and topic-related developments in the field of HRD as described in scientific and non-scientific sources. |
| Conceptual understanding | There are conceptual misunderstandings and definitions of key concepts are missing. The author refers to sources that appear minimally or only generally relevant to defining the proposed research question. Scientific terminology is avoided.  | Basic definitions of the key concepts and existing theories are given. However, the choice of the definitions and theories does not match the topic very well and it is described in a fragmented way. Cites resources both relevant and irrelevant to the problem and research questions. The author uses scientific terminology, but does not always make appropriate choices in terms that are used.  | Key concepts are defined and relationships among key variables and phenomena are described. The author discusses and compares relevant theories. Only resources that are highly relevant to the research question are cited. The author demonstrates adequate understanding of the scope and significance of the problem; uses scientific terminology.  | The author critically discusses the definitions and contradictions in the existing theories. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the scope, significance, and conceptual basis of the problem; uses scientific terminology appropriately. |
| RQ | Research question is not related to the literature as described in the introduction or the research question is missing. | Weakly states how the cited literature contributes to or justifies posing the research question. The research question is lacking a clear structure. | Research question is clearly stated, but the author provides not enough relevant resources to justify this specific question. | Author uses the cited literature to justify the proposed research as a logical next step. Research question is clearly stated. |

1. # Primary sources are sources in which research results are reported, like articles, dissertations and research reports. Secondary sources are sources in which research is summarized, like (hand)books and other reviews. In case you do a meta-review, or in other words a review of other reviews or a theoretical review, then these other reviews or descriptions of theories will become your primary sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)