

MN3311 Dissertation Rubric							
	Superfirst 85% +	First class 84 - 70	2.1 69 - 60	2.2 59 - 50	Third 49 - 40	Narrow fail 39 - 30	Clear fail > 30
Abstract	a succinct and enticing summary acts as the perfect "shop window" to the paper	a lucid summary of the paper which grabs the reader's attention	summary of the paper accurately represents the objectives and content	summary clearly flags the content of the paper	summary fails to clearly indicate the contents of the paper	summary very vaguely or inaccurately sets out the dissertation's content	fails to highlight dissertation's content
Introduction	deep and critical understanding of material required to motivate an innovative research topic; interesting research objectives; thesis overview succinct	critical use of relevant material to motivate a compelling research topic; clear research objectives; thesis overview succinct	clear and convincing rationale for research topic, with no major omissions; lacks innovative or compelling angle; clear research objectives; overview provided	material used shows some understanding of the need for research in this area; research objectives stated; some idea of thesis structure given	limited knowledge of and/or lack of focus on the research area; weak motivation for study; research objectives weak or confused; no overview or too long	limited understanding of how to position the research project in context; no motivation for study; unanswerable research objectives; no overview or too long	fails to address course objectives; no evidence of relevant effort or desire to motivate the study; no research objectives or overview
Lit Review	highly coherent structure; excellent, critical synthesis of theoretical and empirical material,	coherent structure; critical synthesis of materials; narrative flow leads to clear,	coherent structure; sufficient synthesis of materials; some critical engagement to	appropriate structure; whilst using a limited number of sources there is an attempt at evaluation to	simple, insufficiently sophisticated structure; lacks sufficient synthesis of materials to	weak structure; lacks the evaluation of literature to lead to the RQs; RQs present but confusing	inadequate structure; lacks analysis; no or inappropriate RQs

	leading to innovative and compelling RQs	answerable RQs	generate clear, answerable RQs	generate research themes	generate logical RQs		
Method	highly coherent structure; excellent critical synthesis of relevant source material; consideration of means to overcome challenges in executing methodological instrument(s); innovative form	smooth, synthesised structure; wide ranging references to justify choice of method; careful consideration of feasibility of planned method	coherent structure; justify research methodology; clear evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of chosen instrument;	some evaluation of potential methodological instruments; limited engagement with practical challenges to executing method;	partial discussion of potential methodological instrument to address this research question; lacks supporting references; no reference to ethical procedures	insufficient discussion of methodological approaches needed to address stated research questions	lacks meaningful consideration of relevant methods sources
Ethics (where relevant)	reflexive consideration of ethics relevant to this thesis and most issues dealt with	detailed discussion of relevant ethical issues; many issues identified	relevant ethical issues covered and solutions debated but not in much detail;	ethics referenced but not resolved or poorly tackled; lacks detail	ethics only briefly mentioned and generic consideration or confused	ethics barely mentioned	nothing on ethics
Results	crisp and clearly-organised, nonrepetitive reporting of key findings, clearly addressing RQs	a neat and nonrepetitive reporting of key findings which address RQs; accurate use	a clear, well organised reporting of key findings relevant to RQs; interpretation justified but	report of key findings in relation to RQs with some repetition or lack of organisation;	project findings reported but repetition and lack of organisation; insufficient	reports some project findings but not convincing in relation to RQs;	project findings only partially presented, not clear how RQs addressed and

	and justified through data presented, including empirical insights	of tables, extracts or etc to support interpretation	somewhat pedantic and lacks insight	some attempt at justifying interpretation through data presentation	illustration through tables, figures or extracts etc; not clear how RQs are addressed	confusing presentation	many errors of data interpretation and presentation
Discussion	illuminating and compelling summary in relation to existing research; comprehensive identification of the project's limitations and logical next steps; practical implications concisely and realistically extracted	insightful summary in relation to existing research; identifies the project's limitations and suggests logical next steps; some helpful practical implications identified	convincing summary in relation to existing research; major limitations identified and explained; limited consideration of future research requirements; some practical recommendations made	refers to previous research and makes some points of contact; recognises a few limitations but not adequately explained; future research not considered; practice considered but does not link well to research	struggles to link to previous research; very few limitations recognised; no consideration of future research and too much discussion of practical implications	lacks discussion of research implications; limitations listed not entirely accurate nor explained, no future research identified;	findings simply repeated with no or very little discussion or analysis; limitations not recognised; no consideration of future research or practical implications
Conclusion	succinctly and convincingly summarises project achievements, clearly identifying	evaluates the initial objectives for the dissertation against the	presents the dissertation's achievements in an organised and useful way	restates the dissertation's findings with some consideration of contribution but not clear	restates the dissertation's findings with no consideration of contribution	unclear or inaccurate restating of the dissertation's findings	lacks accurate conclusion to the project

	contribution of research	actual achievements					
Writing Style	incisive, sophisticated, fluent prose using academic style of language; complex and compelling argumentation	incisive, fluent prose with use of academic register; convincing and consistent arguments	fluent style with some use of academic register; arguments developed consistently	fluent in places but uneven or thin use of academic register; fails to weave consistent arguments	disjointed, descriptive style; fails to produce arguments to support hypotheses and conclusions	inappropriate style for an academic submission; significant logical errors indicating a lack of proof reading	poor standard of English
Overall Presentation	sophisticated presentation of work including an index of appropriate chapters, labelled figures/tables and appendices (where relevant); overt identification of component parts of paper which are clearly linked; full spell and grammar check	index of chapters, labelled figures/tables and appendices (where relevant); clear identification of component parts of paper which generally link; full spell and grammar check	provides an index of chapters, figures/tables and appendices clearly identified; component parts of paper evident; limited typos, spelling and grammatical errors	provides an index of: chapters, figures/tables and appendices provided but not always clear; separation of component parts of paper; may lack thorough check of spelling & grammar	provides at least some of required content chapters; figures/tables may be messy or missing; lack of care with spelling and grammar	does not provide appendices; fails to clearly separate component parts of paper ; sloppy attention to spellings and grammar	poorly presented work which suggests a lack of proof reading or understanding of appropriate structure

Referencing	excellent presentation; perfectly accurate in-text details; perfectly accurate bibliographical details	excellent presentation; accurate referencing; accurate bibliography	well presented; detailed referencing; well formatted bibliography	adequately presented; some accurate referencing in-text; short but accurate bibliography	weak presentation; little referencing; inadequate bibliographic detail	poor presentation; little accurate in-text referencing; wholly inadequate bibliography	poor presentation; lacks in-text referencing; completely inadequate bibliography
--------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--	--