

Literature Review Rubric (June 08)

Topic, Score, & Alignment S = SED L = LEAD K = K-12 H = HEA	5 Exceptional	4 Proficient	3 Satisfactory	2 Emerging (subject to revision)	1 Unsatisfactory
Synthesis 40% S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research focus is clearly situated in broader scholarly literature and in a historical context • Develops a new direction of research based on what has been done and what needs to be done • Clarifies and resolves ambiguities and contradictions in the literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research focus is situated in broader scholarly literature or in a historical context • Effective examination leads to statement of new direction for research • Ambiguities are acknowledged but only partially resolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some historical context • Emerging new direction in the literature is evident • Sufficient critical analysis and adequate review of key terms and ambiguities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited historical context • Limited critical analysis and partial review of key terms and ambiguities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No historical context given • Poor analysis of topic and field • Key ambiguities and definitions missing
Methodology 10% S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critiques appropriateness and practical significance of research methods • Introduces new research methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies research methods and connects them to proposed research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methods reviewed but limited link made to proposed research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methods discussed but taken at face value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methods not discussed
Significance 10% S-V L-4a K-9 H-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are clearly reviewed and critiqued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are reviewed and critiqued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the practical and scholarly significance of prior research are reviewed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either practical or scholarly significance are reviewed, but not both 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments made about the practical or scholarly significance of prior research

<p>Search & Selection</p> <p>10% S-IVb, V L-4a K-9 H-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a comprehensive and systematic search and selection of material Wide use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources Use of high quality sources, like peer-reviewed articles and empirical studies (quantitative and qualitative) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a broad search and selection of material Consistent use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources Selection of high quality material, like peer-reviewed articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a basic search of some databases and resources Some use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources Some use of high-quality materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a limited search Limited use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources A few well selected materials, but mostly non-scholarly resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of systematic or sufficient search No use of databases, experts, handbooks, and web resources Poor selection of material
<p>Breadth & Scope</p> <p>10% S-V L-4a K-9 H-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently explains why specific topics and material are used Gives criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains why specific topics and material are used Gives some criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses some of the reasons for included and excluded literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor discussion of the reasons for included and excluded literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not discuss the criteria for inclusion or exclusion
<p>Style & Format (APA and AU Standards)</p> <p>10% S-IVa L-2a K-? H-2a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Models language, style, and format of scholarly literature Publishable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Style and format standards consistently applied Accurately documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few errors of style and format Most sources documented correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent style and format Lacks precision in use of quotations and citation of sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Style and format standards not applied Sources plagiarized Clarity compromised by errors
<p>Mechanics (spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence structure)</p> <p>10% S-IVa L-2a K-? H-2a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free of mechanical errors Smooth flow and effective transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few mechanical errors Good flow and strong transitions increase comprehensibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally follows mechanical conventions, but with some minor errors Appropriate transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequent mechanical errors Ineffective transitions and flow from point to point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous mechanical errors, making comprehension almost impossible

Many aspects of this rubric are adapted from Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.