RUBRIC FOR CANDIDATURE DEFENCE

EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision) **6 scale**	GOOD (acceptable with minor revision) **5 scale**	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision) **4 scale**	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision) **3-1 scale**
Introduction (10%)			
The introduction clearly, convincingly and precisely (in relation to or within the research context provides the following: states the problem/issues gives the research questions /objectives states the significance of the study defines operational terms/ definitions	The introduction clearly provides the following: states the problem/issues gives the research questions /objectives states the significance of the study defines operational terms/ definitions	The introduction attempts to address all or most of the following: states the problem/issues gives the research questions /objectives states the significance of the study defines operational terms/ definitions	The introduction fails to address all or most of the following: states the problem/issues gives the research questions /objectives states the significance of the study defines operational terms/ definitions
Literature review (15%)			
The review achieves the following: Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review achieves most of the following: Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review does not achieve most of the following: Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence.	The review fails to achieve the following: Narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and research literature. Attention is given to different perspectives, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence. .
Conceptual Framework / Methods / Approach (20%)			
The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is clear and corresponding justification is convincing and in accordance with acceptable research conventions. This includes: theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures data analysis technique validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches critical awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of approach, techniques, or procedures used	The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is **quite** clear and corresponding justification is **mostly** convincing and in accordance with acceptable research conventions. This includes: theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures data analysis technique validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches ethical aspects and issues **some** awareness of the strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used	The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is **somewhat** clear and corresponding justification is **marginally** convincing and in accordance with acceptable research conventions. Attempts to address all or most of the following, but could be more convincing: theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures data analysis technique validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches ethical aspects and issues **emerging** awareness of the strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used	The description of the conceptual framework and methodology is **not** clear and corresponding justification is **un**convincing and **not** in accordance with acceptable research conventions. Fails to address all or most of the following, but could be more convincing: theoretical framework research sample, sample procedure and technique instrumentation data collection procedures data analysis technique validity and reliability / trustworthiness approaches ethical aspects and issues strengths and weakness of approach, technique, or procedures used
Results / Data Analyses / Findings (20%)			
The analyses and results illustrate the following: are appropriate align with the questions / hypotheses raised show sophistication (e.g. recognize complex patterns in the data) and iteratively explore questions raised by analyses In addition, the amount and quality of data or information is	The analyses and results illustrate much of the following: are appropriate align with the questions / hypotheses raised show sophistication (e.g. recognize complex patterns in the data) and iteratively explore questions raised by analyses In addition, the amount and quality of data or information is **mostly quite:** sufficient	The analyses and results do not illustrate much of the following:: are appropriate align with the questions / hypotheses raised show sophistication (e.g. recognize complex patterns in the data) and iteratively explore questions raised by analyses In addition, the amount and quality of data or information is **mostly not:** sufficient	The analyses and results fail to illustrate the following: : are appropriate align with the questions / hypotheses raised show sophistication (e.g. recognize complex patterns in the data) and iteratively explore questions raised by analyses In addition, the amount and quality of data or information is **not:**

EXCELLENT (acceptable with minor or no revision)	GOOD (acceptable with minor revision)	SATISFACTORY (acceptable with major revision)	UNSATISFACTORY (unacceptable & requires major revision)
6 scale	**5 scale**	**4 scale**	**3-1 scale**
sufficient well presented well interpreted The author also: Critically uses the best available analytical techniques and appropriately created new ones.	well presented well interpreted	well presented well interpreted	sufficient well presented well interpreted

Discussion and Conclusion (20%)			
The discussion and conclusion clearly, convincingly and precisely: Restate the objectives Summarize the findings Provide perspective on the finding Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together Discuss research implications Provide recommendations for future research Highlight the correlation between title proposed and research findings/outcomes.	The discussion and conclusion quite clearly, convincingly and precisely: Restate the objectives Summarize the findings Provide perspective on the finding Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together Discuss research implications Provide recommendation for future research Highlight the correlation between title proposed and research findings/outcomes.	The discussion and conclusion attempts to address all or most of the following, but could be more clear and convincing: Restate the objectives Summarize the findings Provide perspective on the finding Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together Discuss research implications Provide recommendation for future research Highlight the correlation between title proposed and research findings/outcomes.	The discussion and conclusion fails to address all or most of the following clearly and convincingly: Restate the objectives Summarize the findings Provide perspective on the finding Relate back to the introduction and ties everything together Discuss research implications Provide recommendation for future research Highlight the correlation between title proposed and research findings/outcomes.

Academic Style, Language and References (10%)			
Consistently applied standards of language composition, and APA guidelines, especially in regards to citations, references, headings, table of contents, page numbers, and running headers. Limited errors in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and/or punctuation. The reference list is complete and accurate.	Manuscript conformed to most standards of language composition and APA guidelines. Few errors per page that do not impede the meaning in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and/or punctuation The reference list is mostly complete and accurate.	Weak, incomplete, ambiguous, or inconsistent application of APA; manuscript organization, rules of language composition. Noticeable errors that do not impede readability. Moderate editing needed. The reference list is incomplete and / or contains some inaccuracies.	Failure to apply standard rules for manuscript presentation and language composition Errors begin to impede readability. Significant editing needed. Several errors per paragraph informal language used in multiple instances The reference list is incomplete and inaccuracies.

Communication / Presentation (Q&A) (5%)			
The candidate demonstrates the following: Research information presented in logical, interesting and effective sequence and easy to follow. Very clear voice, fluent, confident, very good body-language.	The candidate demonstrates the following: Research information presented in sequence that can be followed. clear voice, fluent, confident, good body-language.	The candidate demonstrates the following: Research information presented in less logical sequence. clear voice, fluent, confident, good body-language.	The candidate demonstrates the following: Research information presented in no logical sequence. Voice not clear, hesitation and no body-language

Marking Scheme:

Marks	Grade	Grade Point	Interpretation
90-100	A+	4.0	
80 – 89	A	4.0	Excellent / Pass
75 - 79	A-	3.7	
70 -74	B+	3.3	Good / Pass
65 - 69	B	3.0	
0 - 64			*Fail / Repeat Candidature Defence Seminar*