

# ICT90003 Applied Research Methods

## Assessment Task 1A: Literature Review Marking Rubric

Discussion (60%)	N (0 – 4.5)	P (5 – 5.5)	C (6 – 6.5)	D (7 – 7.5)	HD (8 – 10)
Introduction (10%)	Problem is not clearly identified; or problem is weakly identified, but introduction is not adequate	The introduction is clear but does not adequately set up the literature review	The introduction is adequate and sets up the literature review properly	PLUS: Introduction shows good understanding of the problem and is written without grammar errors.	PLUS: The introduction captures the nuances of the problem succinctly and sets up the report in a professional manner
Critique, supporting evidence and limitations of study (20%)	Review is plagiarised. Some discussion presented but misses the topic. Discussion is based on information from non-academic sources (e.g., website)	The discussion is a high level summary of the literature with limited review. No limitations are identified	The discussion identifies the key elements of the articles, such as research objectives, arguments & contributions. Limitations are identified but not clearly explained	PLUS: The discussion is well-structured and analyses the key elements of the articles. Limitations are identified and clearly explained	PLUS: The discussion draws from academic sources to investigate the problem. Limitations are identified with excellent explanations
Critical Analysis; Differences in viewpoints (20%)	No evidence of critical analysis; Differences in viewpoints were not highlighted	Weak evidence of critical analysis; Differences in viewpoints were weakly identified	Good evidence of critical assessment of articles and claims; Differences in viewpoints were identified and discussed	PLUS: The critique shows rigour with little or no bias; Differences in viewpoints were adequately addressed	PLUS: The critique questions the evidence and claims presented; Differences in viewpoints were critically evaluated
Current state-of-the-art and Implications of study (10%)	Implication of study or state-of-the-art was not presented	Generic information on implication of study or state-of-the-art was presented	Implications and state-of-the-art were discussed as presented in the articles reviewed	PLUS: Clearly identifies link between critique and future plan for research	PLUS: Discussions highlight broader implications not discussed in the articles
Sources (20%)	N (0 – 4.5)	P (5 – 5.5)	C (6 – 6.5)	D (7 – 7.5)	HD (8 – 10)
Articles & Sources (10%)	Articles are not from acceptable sources; Less than 2 articles were reviewed	At least 2 articles were reviewed; One article is from acceptable journal or database	At least 3 articles were reviewed; Two articles are from acceptable journals & databases	At least 4 articles were reviewed; Three articles are from acceptable journals & databases	4 or more articles were reviewed; all articles are from acceptable journals & databases
Search Method & Justification for selected articles (10%)	No justification provided; Search method is not identified	Weak justification provided; Search method is loosely mentioned	Justification provided is acceptable; Search method is briefly discussed	Good justification of selected articles; Search method is adequately discussed	Excellent justification of selected articles; Search method is competently discussed

<b>Presentation, Style and References (20%)</b>	<b>N (0 – 4.5)</b>	<b>P (5 – 5.5)</b>	<b>C (6 – 6.5)</b>	<b>D (7 – 7.5)</b>	<b>HD (8 – 10)</b>
Structure and flow of report (10%)	Paragraph focuses on more than one discussion. Poor linkage between sections of report. There are grammar and spelling mistakes	Paragraph and sentence are well structured. Links between sections are clear and helps with flow of report. Spelling and documentation mistakes are few and far between	PLUS: Report is easy to follow, with good evidence of linkage between sections. Spelling and documentation mistakes are very minor	PLUS: Paragraphs and sentence structures are competently constructed. Report flows well and has clear linkage between sections. No significant documentation issue	PLUS: Report is written in a professional manner and clearly targeted to an academic audience.
Presentation (5%)	Headings are not clear in meaning; Formatting and labelling are not implemented properly.	Headings are used, and possibly numbered. They are clear in meaning. Formatting is sufficiently implemented with only minor issues. Tables and figures are labelled (where applicable).	Headings are used and numbered. The meanings are clear and relates well with the section. Report is well formatted. Tables and figures are labelled properly (where applicable)	PLUS: Headings, labelling and formatting are implemented with no significant issues.	PLUS: Presentation is executed professionally. Headings, labelling and formatting follow standard conventions
References and referencing (5%)	Referencing is not adequately implemented	Some attempt at referencing sources of information	Good referencing skills demonstrated. Some minor errors with in-text citations or the reference list	PLUS: Reference list and in-text referencing are competently executed with no significant error	PLUS: Excellent referencing skills demonstrated. Reference list and in-text referencing are professionally executed