

Scorecard for Assessing Research Papers

| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Positioning | The writing positions the research relative to the status quo, including existing theories and studies. It clearly shows the knowledge gap the research addresses. | The writing accurately summarizes the status quo but does not explicitly connect the research with a specific knowledge gap. | The writing provides some general context for the research, but some aspects of the context may be missing or stated inaccurately. | The goal of the research is stated, but it's not connected with existing research and knowledge gaps. |
| Logical structure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing centres on a single governing idea, and - Each main idea directly connects to and develops the governing idea, and - Sections and paragraphs are organized into cohesive units. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing expresses a clear governing idea, and - Each main idea directly connects to and develops the governing idea, and - Sections and paragraphs may occasionally lack cohesion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The writing expresses a central idea, but it lacks clarity, and/or - Main ideas do not connect directly to the central idea (some ideas may be relevant but tangential), and/or - Sections and paragraphs tend to be loosely organized. | The writing lacks a clear central idea and is loosely focused throughout. The writing rambles without a clear sense of direction. |
| Comprehensiveness | The methodology, results, and discussion sections include everything a reader would need to know in order to replicate the study. | The methodology, results, and discussion sections provide an accurate picture of what happened in the study. | The methodology, results, and discussion sections are mainly accurate, but some minor points may be missing or misrepresented. | The methodology, results, and discussion sections are missing key points. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Complexity of Thought | The writing: - examines the methodology and results from multiple angles, and -acknowledges limitations of the research, and -creates a persuasive argument, supported by compelling evidence, and - points to possibilities for future research | The writing: -examines the methodology and results from more than one angle, and - supports key points of the discussion with valid evidence | The writing: - examines the methodology and results thoroughly, but from only one angle, and/or - supports some key points of the discussion with evidence | The writing examines the methodology and results only partially and/or provides weak support for key points |
| Clarity of Expression | The writing expresses ideas using wording that's clear, correct according to the conventions of Standard Edited English, and concise. Minor, infrequent errors do not interfere with the reader's understanding. | The writing expresses ideas using wording that's mostly clear, correct, and concise. Occasional breaches of the conventions of Standard Edited English slow down reading but do not compromise clarity. | The writing suffers from some issues of clarity and/or correctness. It frequently breaches conventions of Standard Edited English so that the reader may sometimes need to re-read a sentence to grasp its meaning. | The writing suffers from serious issues of clarity and/or correctness. Frequent and significant breaches of conventions of Standard Edited English prevent the reader from understanding the writer's meaning. |

Score: /20

Comments: