# Rubric for Critical Business Inquiry (CSE4072-N)

| UTREG Criteria | Guidelines | Marks | 0% - 19% | 20% - 39% | 40% - 49% | 50% - 59% | 60% - 69% | 70% - 79% | 80% - 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence of wider reading and research, including identification of key authors | Introduction with research aim and objectives | *20%* | ***0.00 – 3.80*** | ***4.00 – 7.80*** | ***8.00 – 9.80*** | ***10.00 – 11.80*** | ***12.00 – 13.80*** | ***14.00 – 15.80*** | ***16.00 - 20.00*** |
| | | | Research topic is vague, or incomprehensible. No background information provided. No rationale provided. Aim and objective(s) are missing, to the research topic. | Research topic is unclear or poorly defined. Minimal background provided. Weak or poorly justified rationale. Aim and objective(s) are present unclear, or unrelated from the study's context. Introduction is poorly organized. | Research topic is present but lacks accuracy. Background information is present but insufficient. Weak or poorly justified rationale. Aim and objective(s) are present but poorly defined. Introduction has basic structure but contains several errors. | Research topic is clear but could be better refined. Background is adequate but lacks depth. Rationale is adequate. Aim and objective(s) are defined but lack specificity or alignment with the study's focus. Introduction is organized but contain minor errors. | Research topic is mostly clear and relevant. Background provides relevant context. Rationale is clear and justified, with evidence. Aim and objective(s) are mostly clear, specific, and relevant. Introduction is well-organized and coherent, with minimal errors. | Research topic is well-articulated, and clearly defined. Background is comprehensive, relevant, and effective. Rationale is strong, well-developed, and effectively justifies. Aim and objective(s) are well-defined, specific, and strongly aligned with the study's purpose. Introduction is well-structured, coherent, and largely free of errors. | Research topic is exceptionally clear, and thoroughly defined. Background is exceptionally and relevant. Rationale is compelling and detailed. Aim and objective(s) are exceptionally clear, and fully aligned with the research. Introduction is exceptionally well-structured, coherent, and error-free. |
| Demonstrate understanding of the concepts and theories introduced during the module | Theoretical frameworks and literature review | *30%* | ***0.00 – 5.94*** | ***5.95– 11.94*** | ***11.95 – 14.94*** | ***14.95 – 17.94*** | ***17.95– 20.94*** | ***20.95 – 23.94*** | ***23.95 - 30.00*** |
| | | | No theoretical frameworks identified. Literature review is missing. Sources are not cited. | Frameworks are irrelevant to address the research objectives. Minimal engagement, lacking depth and includes irrelevant sources. Heavy reliance on inappropriate or non-scholarly sources. Poorly structured. | Frameworks are identified but lack clarity or very limited relevance to the research objectives. Very limited engagement with relevant literature. Basic structure is present but fails clear organization or logical flow. | Frameworks are moderately relevant. Adequate review with relevant sources. Structure is adequate, though flow and coherence could be improved. | Frameworks are relevant and connected to research objectives. Good review with relevant sources and some critical analysis. Well-structured and coherent review with minor issues in logical flow. | Frameworks are highly relevant, well-integrated, and address the research objectives. Thorough review with relevant sources, well-analyzed, and critically evaluated. Highly coherent and logically structured review. | Frameworks are exceptionally relevant, critically evaluated with the research objectives. Exceptional review with extensive, relevant, and critically evaluated sources, providing deep insight. Exceptionally coherent and logically structured review. |
| Referenced discussion of proposed research methods | Paradigm, sampling | *5%* | ***0.00 – 0.95*** | ***1.00 – 1.95*** | ***2.00 – 2.45*** | ***2.50 – 2.95*** | ***3.00 – 3.45*** | ***3.50 – 3.95*** | ***4.00 - 5.00*** |
| | | | No evidence of understanding the research paradigm. Sampling approach is missing. | Minimal understanding of the paradigm. Sampling approach is minimally explained and unsuitable for the research objectives. | Very basic understanding of the paradigm. Sampling approach is explained but lacks clarity. | Adequate understanding of the paradigm, with some connections to research objectives. Sampling approach is adequately explained. | Good understanding of the paradigm, relevant to research objectives but lacking critical insight. Sampling approach is well-explained and relevant. | Strong understanding of the paradigm, well-articulated, and aligned with the research objectives. Sampling approach is clear and demonstrates critical awareness of relevance. | Exceptional understanding and critical evaluation of the paradigm, demonstrating advanced insight. Sampling approach is exceptionally appropriate, critically evaluated, and demonstrates advanced insight. |

| UTREG Criteria | Guidelines | Marks | 0% - 19% | 20% - 39% | 40% - 49% | 50% - 59% | 60% - 69% | 70% - 79% | 80% - 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Research Design (Quantitative, Qualitative, or SLR-specific criteria such as keywords, and inclusion/exclusion criteria) | *10%* | ***0.00 – 1.9*** | ***2.00 – 3.90*** | ***4.00 – 4.90*** | ***5.00 – 5.90*** | ***6.00 – 6.90*** | ***7.00 – 7.90*** | ***8.00 - 10.00*** |
| | | | No evidence of research design or entirely irrelevant to the research objectives. Paradigm, sampling, and designs are entirely disconnected or incoherent. | Research designs are weakly described and largely irrelevant or inappropriate. Minimal connection between paradigm, sampling, and design. | Research designs are described but no alignment with research objectives. Very limited connection between paradigm, sampling, and design. | Research designs are adequately described and mostly aligned with the research objectives. Adequate integration of paradigm, sampling, and design. | Research design s are well-justified and clearly relevant to the research objectives. Clear integration of paradigm, sampling, and designs; minor inconsistencies. | Research designs are strongly justified, well-explained, and highly relevant to the research. Strong integration of paradigm, sampling, and designs. | Research designs are exceptionally justified, critically evaluated, and demonstrate deep relevance to the research. Exceptional integration of paradigm, sampling, and designs. |
| Referenced discussion of the proposed data collection design | Data collection process (tools and techniques used, if using SLR a PRISMA diagram need to present) | *10%* | ***0.00 – 1.9*** | ***2.00 – 3.90*** | ***4.00 – 4.90*** | ***5.00 – 5.90*** | ***6.00 – 6.90*** | ***7.00 – 7.90*** | ***8.00 - 10.00*** |
| | | | No description of the data collection process. Data collection process is entirely irrelevant to the research objectives. No use of appropriate tools or techniques for data collection. | Minimal or vague description of the process. Poor relevance of the data collection process to the research objectives. Minimal or inappropriate use of tools and techniques. | Very basic description of the data collection process. Data collection process is somewhat relevant but lacks clear alignment to the research objectives. Basic use of tools and techniques, with noticeable gaps. | Adequate description of the process; but limited in detail. Data collection process is relevant and somewhat aligned with research objectives. Adequate use of tools and techniques; appropriate but lacks sophistication. | Detailed and mostly clear description of the data collection process. Process is clearly relevant and mostly aligned with the research objectives. Effective use of tools and techniques, demonstrating a good level of rigor. | Comprehensive and clear description, demonstrating strong understanding of the process. Highly relevant and strongly aligned with the research objectives, with minor limitations. Excellent use of tools and techniques, demonstrating suitability for the research. | Exceptional clarity and depth in describing the data collection process. Exceptionally relevant process, seamlessly aligned with and contributing to the research objectives. Exceptional use of tools and techniques, demonstrating advanced rigor. |
| | Ethics | *10%* | ***0.00 – 1.9*** | ***2.00 – 3.90*** | ***4.00 – 4.90*** | ***5.00 – 5.90*** | ***6.00 – 6.90*** | ***7.00 – 7.90*** | ***8.00 - 10.00*** |
| | | | No clear understanding of ethics. No understanding of the ethical requirements for research. No description or entirely incorrect process for obtaining ethical permission from the university. | Demonstrates poor understanding of ethics. Poor understanding of ethical requirements. Minimal or vague description of the process, with key steps missing or unclear. | Provides a very basic understanding of ethics. Very basic understanding of ethical requirements. Basic description of the process; lacks depth and may miss some critical steps. | Provides an adequate understanding of key ethical principles. Adequate understanding of requirements; but lacks detail or depth. Adequate description of the process; includes most key steps but lacks detail. | Clear and detailed understanding of ethical principles. Clear understanding of ethical requirements, relevant to the research. Clear and detailed description of the process, with all key steps included. | Strong and insightful understanding of ethics. Strong understanding of ethical requirements and relevance to the research context. Comprehensive and well-structured description of the process. | Exceptional and comprehensive advanced understanding of ethics. Exceptional understanding of ethical requirements; and highly relevant. Exceptionally detailed and fully aligned with university standards. |
| Referenced discussion of data analysis | Data analysis techniques | *10%* | ***0.00 – 1.9*** | ***2.00 – 3.90*** | ***4.00 – 4.90*** | ***5.00 – 5.90*** | ***6.00 – 6.90*** | ***7.00 – 7.90*** | ***8.00 - 10.00*** |
| | | | No data analysis techniques identified. No justification for selected techniques. Proposed techniques are not feasible within the research context. | Minimal identification; proposed techniques are largely irrelevant. Weak justification. Very limited feasibility; | Very basic identification of techniques; but lacks. Very basic justification. Techniques may not be fully | Adequate identification of techniques. Adequate justification; aligns with research but lacks sophistication. Adequate feasibility; | Clear identification of relevant techniques; demonstrates good understanding. Clear and relevant justification of research | Strong and detailed identification of appropriate techniques. Strong justification with insightful alignment to research objectives. Strong feasibility; | Exceptional identification of appropriate techniques. Exceptional and critical justification; demonstrates advanced understanding. |

| UTREG Criteria | Guidelines | Marks | 0% - 19% | 20% - 39% | 40% - 49% | 50% - 59% | 60% - 69% | 70% - 79% | 80% - 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | techniques are impractical or unrealistic. | implementable or realistic. | techniques are implementable but may have minor practical issues. | requirements. Clear feasibility; techniques are practical and relevant to the research. | techniques are practical and relevant to the research. | Exceptional feasibility; and highly practical to the research context |
| Presentation of a viable research project schedule | Structure and viable research project schedule | *5%* | ***0.00 – 0.95*** | ***1.00 – 1.95*** | ***2.00 – 2.45*** | ***2.50 – 2.95*** | ***3.00 – 3.45*** | ***3.50 – 3.95*** | ***4.00 - 5.00*** |
| | | | The proposal structure is missing or entirely incoherent. The research project plan is absent or demonstrates no understanding of research processes. | The proposal structure is incomplete or lacks coherence. The research project plan is vague, poorly developed, and does not align with research goals. | The proposal structure is basic but lacks clarity and organization. The research project plan is underdeveloped, with very limited alignment to research process and timelines. | The proposal structure is acceptable but lacks polish and some coherence. The research project plan provides a basic outline, but key elements are either missing. | The proposal structure is clear with some minor inconsistencies. The research project plan is adequately developed, includes relevant elements, but may lack depth or refinement. | The proposal structure is well-organized and coherent. The research project plan is detailed, includes appropriate timelines and demonstrates a solid understanding. | The proposal structure is exemplary, highly coherent, and professional. The research project plan is exceptionally well-developed, detailed, and fully aligned with research process. |