

TOWARDS A STANDARDIZED RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING DISSERTATIONS IN DIDACTICS: THE CASE OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, BLIDA 2 UNIVERSITY



Abla BENBELLAL *

Blida 2 University - Ali LOUNICI

a.benbellel@univ-blida2.dz

Date of submission: 17/02/2026 Date of acceptance: 24/05/2026 Date of publication: 08/06/2026



Abstract:

In higher education, well-designed rubrics ensure transparency, consistency, and quality in students' assessment. In the English Department, at Blida 2 University, the rubric used for over seven years to assess Master's dissertations in Didactics exhibits several limitations including a holistic nature, vague performance descriptors and lack of alignment with academic standards. This research proposes an analytic, standards-based rubric that offers clear criteria and detailed descriptors for each dissertation section. The design process involved discussions with teachers and students, content analysis of the existing rubric, and a review of established dissertation writing frameworks. The proposed rubric is expected to enhance fairness and objectivity, and support students' academic writing development.

Keywords:

Assessment, Analytic Rubric, Didactics, Master's dissertations..

Introduction

The importance of rubrics in higher education cannot be denied as they enable teachers to ensure consistent, fair and transparent evaluation of students' work. According to the literature (e.g.; Allen & Tanner, 2006; Taylor et al, 2024; Wolf & Stevens, 2007), an

* Corresponding Author

effective rubric should go beyond its evaluative role which often focuses on providing a summative, impressionistic judgment of the final product without a clear picture of students' strengths and weaknesses. Instead, rubrics should also serve a pedagogical function by guiding students in understanding performance expectations and helping them identify what constitutes high-quality work.

Particularly in the context of dissertation and thesis assessment, rubrics, when effectively designed, assist assessors (supervisors and examiners) in operationalizing academic criteria, making the evaluation process more accurate, transparent and fair. However, when a rubric is poorly designed or formulated in vague terms that fail to clarify what is expected from students, it may not achieve these intended goals. This appears to be the case with the rubric currently used to assess Master's dissertations in the English Department at Blida 2 University which shows several weaknesses in its structure and application.

To begin with, the rubric adopts a holistic format, and the limited number of the criteria listed does not reflect the complexity of the dissertation as a research document. In more detail, the criteria are too broad and imprecise as they offer a little indication of what constitutes quality in each specific part of the dissertation. As a result, students are often unable to understand what aspects of their work are being assessed, why certain scores are assigned, and how to improve their work. Moreover, the holistic nature of the current rubric leaves a considerable interpretive space for examiners who may prioritize different aspects or overlook important elements of a high quality dissertation. This lack of specification undermines consistency and fairness in evaluation. In addition, the rubric's wording relies heavily on evaluative expressions rather than clear descriptive indicators of performance. Such phrasing is likely to lead to subjective interpretation and reduce the reliability and transparency of assessment outcomes. These weaknesses are exemplified in the following extracts from the current rubric:

Table 1: Limitations of the Current Rubric

Examples (Criteria)	Problem identified	Suggested Improvement
“ <u>Adequate</u> description of the background to the problem”	What does ‘ <i>adequate</i> ’ mean? Each assessor is likely to interpret it differently according to their own understanding. Moreover, it is not clear what the background section is expected to include in terms of its schematic structure.	The designer(s) should clarify what the term ‘adequate’ specifically means by providing details about the main components of the background section in order to ensure a common interpretation among all assessors.
“The research problem <u>clearly defined</u> ”	What does ‘ <i>clearly defined</i> ’ mean? Both assessors and students may find it difficult to determine what exactly constitutes a clearly defined research problem.	The designer(s) should provide a detailed explanation of the key components and defining characteristics of the problem statement.
“Rationale gives a <u>convincing justification</u> for the research”	What does ‘ <i>convincing justification</i> ’ actually mean? What elements should students include in this section to clearly demonstrate the significance of their research to readers?	The rubric designer(s) should specify the expectations regarding how students should justify their research and the components to be included in the rationale section such as the research gap and contributions of the study.
“In-text referencing of sources is <u>appropriate</u> ”	What does the term ‘ <i>appropriate</i> ’ actually mean in this context? Which referencing style is being referred to? Moreover, what characterizes an appropriate use of in-text citations according to the style used, and what particular rules should be followed?	Since the Didactics team in the English Department at Blida 2 University allows students to use either APA or MLA referencing styles, it is essential that the rubric clearly specifies what is expected from students when applying each style.

“Research methods clearly <u>described</u> and <u>justified</u> ”	What does ‘ <i>clearly described</i> ’ mean? No details are provided about what the description should include.	The rubric designer(s) should provide a detailed guidance on the elements that should be addressed in the methodology chapter.
Data treatment and presentation	This so-called criterion appears in the rubric as the heading ‘ <i>Data Treatment and Presentation</i> ’. No further detail is provided to clarify what is expected from students. There is no reference to how this section should be organized or what specific elements it should include.	The rubric designer(s) should clearly specify the expected content and quality indicators.

As shown in the examples presented in Table 1, words such as ‘*clear*’, ‘*adequate*’, ‘*appropriate*’, ‘*convincing*’, and ‘*clearly*’, which are intended to evaluate the content and different parts of the dissertation are too general and vague. They can carry multiple interpretations for different assessors at different times. As a result, neither the teacher, nor the students can clearly identify what constitutes each section or what features define the quality of the work as good or weak.

A good rubric should be reliable and consist of value-free and clearly defined criteria that can be interpreted consistently by all assessors and lead to comparable scoring outcomes. Therefore, it is highly recommended that teachers collaboratively design a common analytic rubric for the assessment of Master’s dissertations that includes agreed-upon definitions of key concepts and criteria to ensure fairness, transparency and reliability in evaluation.

Accordingly, the aim of this research is to revisit the current rubric used in the English Department, Blida 2, to assess Master’s dissertations in Didactics and identify its limitations. More specifically, the study seeks to design and propose an analytic comprehensive rubric that provides clear, value-free and measurable criteria for assessing the different sections and chapters that constitute

a quality dissertation. In doing so, the study aims to promote a more transparent and systematic assessment process.

1. Theoretical Frameworks for Dissertation Writing and Assessment

This section briefly presents the main frameworks and guides that informed the conceptualization of the rubric:

1.1. Swales' CARS Model (2004)

Swales' framework is arguably the most well-known and widely applied for analyzing the introductory and literature review sections of various academic genres including research articles, dissertations and theses across a range of disciplines. Known as the CARS (Create A Research Space) model, it consists of three main moves; each move is subdivided into specific steps. These moves are: *1) Establishing a territory* by making topic generalizations and claiming centrality, *2) Establishing a niche* through counter claiming and indicating research gap; and *3) Presenting the present work* by announcing the current research, providing definitions, and stating the value of the study.

1.2. Paltridge and Starfield (2007) - Schematic Structure of Dissertations and Theses

Paltridge and Starfield, in their book '*Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language*', provide a comprehensive and detailed guide for both students and supervisors. Their work explicitly outlines the expectations, conventions, schematic structure and organization of the main sections and chapters that constitute a typical dissertation, namely the abstract, the general introduction, the literature review, the methodology, and the results and discussions chapters.

1.3. Chen and Kuo's Framework (2012)

It was developed to analyze and assess the structure of Master's dissertations in the field of Applied linguistics. In analyzing each part of the dissertation, the researchers drew on universal frameworks (e.g., Kwan, 2006; Lim, 2006; Ruiying & Allison, 2003; Swales, 2004), revisited and updated them to better reflect the complexity and structure of the dissertation genre.

1.4. Hyatts and Roberts (2024)

It is a comprehensive guide that outlines the main stages of dissertation and thesis writing; from selecting a research topic to drafting the different chapters and preparing for the oral defence.

The principles, characteristics, and communicative functions associated with the various dissertation sections, as outlined in these frameworks, informed the formulation of the qualitative performance descriptors and the design of the organization criteria in the proposed rubric presented in **Appendix A**.

2. Rubric Design Process

The rubric design process went through the following stages:

2.1. Exploratory Phase

The design process started with informal discussions with Master's students and dissertation advisors to explore their perspectives on dissertation writing practices and assessment procedures. These discussions revealed diverse and, sometimes, conflicting views regarding the components and expected content of each dissertation section despite the use of an official rubric in the English department for nearly a decade.

2.2. Content Analysis of the Current Rubric

Following these initial insights, the current rubric was analyzed to identify its limitations and areas that lack alignment with the existing academic conventions. Although some of these limitations have been already outlined in the problem statement, they served here as the starting point for the rubric's redesign process.

2.3. Consultation of Universal Academic Frameworks

This preliminary analysis prompted a consultation of universal academic frameworks on dissertation writing and assessment (e.g., Chen & Kuo, 2012; Hyatt & Roberts, 2024; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Swales, 2004). These frameworks provided structural guidance for defining what each part of the dissertation should include and how the different components should be assessed. This phase (i.e.; Review of academic frameworks) ensured that the newly designed rubric combined universally recognized expectations with the specific teaching and learning context of the English Department at Blida 2 University.

2.4. Designing and Piloting the Rubric

Based on the consultation of universal assessment frameworks and with reference to the contextual realities of Didactics in the English Department, an analytic rubric was designed. The rubric includes qualitative descriptors that guide students step by step towards producing a quality dissertation and assist teachers in

ensuring consistent and fair evaluation. Further details about the rubric are provided in the section titled ‘*Description of the Rubric*’

Following the design of the rubric, it was piloted on a sample of twenty Master’s dissertations in Didactics to evaluate its practicality, functionality, and its effectiveness in ensuring transparent and objective assessment practices. The rubric was further pedagogically tested with Master 2 students in academic writing classes across two academic years (2023/2024 and 2024/2025) as an instructional tool to familiarize students with dissertation writing conventions and expectations.

3. Comparison Overview

The weaknesses of the current rubric used in the English Department, as identified in the problem statement, call for the development of an analytic assessment tool that not only ensures adherence to academic standards but also guides students to produce high-quality dissertations.

To better clarify the improvements and contributions of the proposed rubric, the following table (Table 2) presents a comparison between the key features of the current rubric used at the English Department and the newly designed one focusing on aspects such as: structure, descriptors, assessment objectivity, usability and pedagogical function.

Table 2. Comparison between the Current and Proposed Master’s Dissertation Assessment Rubrics.

Dimensions	Current rubric used in the English Department	Proposed rubric	Contributions of the proposed rubric
Structure/ level of detail	*It is highly general. *Each criterion is presented in a single line without indicators that specify what needs improvement, what is missing, or what should be included.	*It is detailed *Three - level qualitative indicators are present to clearly define the expected standards in each part of the	Increased precision and transparency

		dissertation.	
Descriptors	*8 descriptors are used to rate performance (<i>ranging from very poor to excellent</i>), and each descriptor is associated with a corresponding mark. * It does not specify the criteria that distinguish a very poor performance from an excellent one. * It relies on vague evaluative adjectives as illustrated in Table 1	*It adopts a detailed structure and employs qualitative performance indicators that clearly define the standards and expectations of a high quality dissertation.	Standardized application of criteria.
Assessment objectivity	*It leaves a considerable room for assessors' subjective interpretations as it employs numerical scores without detailed qualitative descriptors	*It is more objective as, in addition to numerical scores, it includes precise qualitative indicators that explicitly clarify what distinguishes one performance level from another.	Increased inter-rater reliability and transparent assessment
Usability and pedagogical function	*It serves primarily as a holistic assessment tool that lacks a detailed framework that explains the evaluation criteria, and clarifies to students what they are expected to include in their	*It serves as both an assessment and instructional tool that explicitly articulates the expectations and criteria for	Higher awareness of academic writing conventions

	dissertations to meet academic writing standards.	dissertation writing and evaluation.	
--	---	--	--

The comparison between the current and the proposed rubric demonstrates a significant shift in the assessment of the Master's dissertations in Didactics at the English Department. While the current rubric, as shown in table 1, follows a holistic approach which is suitable primarily for summative assessment (i.e.; evaluating the final product), the proposed rubric introduces an analytic and formative approach that clarifies assessment criteria, reduces subjectivity, and assigns equal weight to the writing process and final product. This shift, as a result, promotes greater transparency, consistency and fairness in evaluation. Moreover, the proposed rubric extends beyond a mere assessment tool. Instead, it functions as a pedagogical instrument that offers detailed performance descriptors that enable students to monitor their progress and engage in a critical self-reflection on their academic writing.

4. Description of the Proposed Rubric

The rubric is presented in the form of a table (See *Appendix A*) that consists of six main rows, each corresponding to a specific part of the dissertation namely: the abstract, the general introduction, the literature review chapter, the methodology chapter, the results and discussions chapter and the general conclusion. Each of these rows is further divided into sub-rows that provide a detailed description of the assessment criteria and the key elements that students are expected to include in each section/chapter to meet the standards of a quality dissertation. Moreover, the rubric is organized into five columns: Section/chapter, Criterion, Needs Revision (*issues identified*), Developing (*what is missing*), and Meets Expectations (*what should be included*). An additional column is devoted to grades allocation, which allows assessors to assign a specific mark for each section based on performance levels as demonstrated in the following excerpt which focuses on the abstract and the problem statement sub-section from the general introduction in the proposed rubric.

Table 3. Extract from the Proposed Rubric

Section	Criterion	Needs Revisions	Developing	Meets	Final
---------	-----------	-----------------	------------	-------	-------

		(Issues identified)	(What is missing)	Expectations (What should be included)	score
A B S T R A C T		* The abstract is too lengthy for a concise summary. ☐ * The abstract includes unnecessary background. ☐ * The abstract does not include the key words. ☐ * The abstract does not include the essential academic elements (aim, methods, main findings, main conclusions) ☐ * The abstract contains details/points that were not discussed in the core sections/chapters of the dissertation ☐	*The abstract includes all the required elements , but they are not clearly articulated. ☐ *The abstract includes some unnecessary details or references ☐	*The abstract clearly states the aim of the study. ☐ * The abstract clearly indicates the adopted research design, sample size, and data collection instruments. ☐ * The abstract effectively summarizes the main findings of the study. ☐ * The abstract briefly states the main conclusions/ implications of the study. ☐	
	Problem Statement	*Too vague and broad problem statement that lacks specificity (i.e. no details about what	*The problem is stated but includes many unnecessary details or	*The problem is clear, detailed and understandable ☐ *The statement	

G E N E R A L I N T R O D U C T I O N		exactly the problem is, when & where it happened, and who is affected) ☐ *The problem statement includes solutions to the issue being investigated ☐ *The statement contains several unsupported assumptions and makes broad over-generalizations that go beyond the context of the study. ☐ * The section mixes the problem statement with the aims of the study (i.e.; It describes what the researcher will do instead of clearly defining the problem that should be studied.) ☐	jargons that make it difficult for the reader to understand the core issue. ☐ *The problem is stated but overlooks the target population ☐	describes the issue that the study addresses in relation to the target population and the context of the study ☐ *The statement provides solid evidence to justify the existence of the problem in the context through factual references of a pilot study ☐	

As shown in Table 3, the proposed rubric goes beyond general evaluative comments that are open to subjective interpretations. Instead, it introduces qualitative performance indicators that clearly specify what is expected in each part of the dissertation. These indicators serve both teachers (assessors) by ensuring consistent and transparent evaluation, and students by providing explicit guidance on the required academic standards. For instance, when assessing the problem statement in the general introduction, the “*Meets expectations*” level requires the statement to be clearly formulated, to provide a detailed description of the problem in relation to the research context and target population, and to be grounded in solid evidence that justifies the existence and relevance of the problem. The full version of the rubric, covering all dissertation chapters and assessment dimensions, is provided in *Appendix A* for reference.

5. Pedagogical and Instructional Value of the Proposed Rubric

Beyond its role as an evaluative instrument, the proposed rubric also functions as a pedagogical tool that fosters students’ awareness of quality criteria and develops their abilities to critically evaluate both their own writing and that of their peers. The rubric as an instructional/pedagogical tool is defined by Andrade (2000) as “a document that articulates the expectations for an assignment by listing the criteria, or what counts and describing levels of quality from excellent to poor.” (Cited in Andrade & Du, 2005, p.1). The proposed rubric can serve as a valuable tool that benefits both students and teachers/assessors in various ways.

To begin with, the proposed rubric is expected to provide students with a detailed framework that clearly explains the assessment criteria and specifies what is required of them. It helps the students expect what their teachers expect and which key aspects they need to focus on in order to meet the standards of academic writing. Moreover, the proposed rubric is believed to not only help students produce quality work, but also to enable teachers to provide specific and informative feedback, leading to more efficient, consistent and unbiased grading. That is, the current rubric adopted in the department may lead assessors to rely mainly on their general impressions when grading students’ work and, consequently, provide comments that can sometimes be vague and difficult for students to interpret. In contrast, the proposed rubric may help generate more diagnostic feedback and offer students a clearer understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of their work.

Equally important, the proposed rubric can be employed in supervision meetings to structure discussions between students and supervisors and ensure that feedback is aligned with explicit and shared assessment criteria. Applying the proposed rubric is also expected to help teachers promote more objective and transparent evaluation practices and reduce the complaints or misunderstanding with students.

Conclusion

This research aimed to design an analytic, standards-based rubric in response to the shortcomings identified in the rubric currently used to assess Master's dissertations in the English Department at Blida 2 University. As discussed in this article, the design of the proposed rubric was primarily informed by well-established frameworks on dissertation writing with the purpose of developing a tool that aligns academic writing standards with the pedagogical realities of the department. Unlike the current rubric, the proposed one serves both evaluative and instructional functions. That is, with its detailed and comprehensive structure, it enables assessors to conduct transparent, consistent and fair evaluations while it simultaneously provides students with a clear, step-by-step guide to the expectations they must meet in order to produce a high-quality dissertation.

Future studies can explore students' and teachers' perspectives on the effectiveness of the proposed rubric in enhancing writing quality and successfully meeting universal conventions. By aligning assessment with instructional goals, the rubric's dual function is expected to promote more effective and constructive feedback practices.

Bibliography

Allen, D. & Tanner, K. (2006). Rubrics: Tools for making learning goals and evaluation criteria explicit for both teachers and learners, *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 5, pp. 197–203

Andrade, H.G. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13 – 18. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ609600>

Andrade, H.G. (2001). The effects of instructional rubrics on learning to write. *Current Issues in Education*. 4(4), 1 - 22. https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/etap_fac_scholar/6/

Andrade, H.G. & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*. 10(3), 1 – 11. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237569071_Student_perspectives_on_rubric-referenced_assessment

Chen, T.Y., & Kuo, C.H. (2012). A genre-based analysis of the information structure of master's theses in applied linguistics. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 8(1), 24-52. <https://www.asian-esp-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Volume-8-1.pdf>

Hyatt, L. & Roberts, C. (2024). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing and defending your dissertation* (4th ed.), Corwin Press.

Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language: A handbook for supervisors*. Routledge

Ruiying, Y., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(4), 365-385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(02\)00026-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1)

Sharma, V. (2019). Teacher perspicacity to using rubrics in students' EFL learning and assessment. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 1(1), 16 - 31. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337771674_Teacher_Perspicacity_to_Using_Rubrics_in_Students'_EFL_Learning_and_Assessment

Taylor, B., Kisby, F. & Reed, A. (2024). Rubrics in higher education: An exploration of undergraduate students' understanding and perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(6), pp. 799–809

Wolf, K., & Stevens, E. (2007). The role of rubrics in advancing and assessing student learning. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*. 7(1), pp. 3 - 11

Appendix A: Full Rubric for Assessing Master’s Dissertations in Didactics

Section/ Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (0.5/2)	Developing (What is missing) (1.25/2)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (2/2)	Score / 2
Abstract					
		• The abstract is too lengthy for a concise summary. ☐ • The abstract does not include the key words. ☐ • The abstract does not include the essential academic elements (aim, methods, main findings, main conclusions) ☐ • The abstract contains details/points that were not discussed in the core sections/chapters of the dissertation. ☐	• The abstract includes all the required elements , but they are not clearly articulated. ☐ • The abstract includes some or all required academic elements, but they are presented in multiple paragraphs instead of a single, coherent paragraph ☐ • The abstract includes unnecessary background and references ☐	• The abstract clearly states the aim of the study. ☐ • The abstract clearly indicates the adopted research design, sample size, and data collection instruments. ☐ • The abstract effectively summarizes the main findings of the study. ☐ • The abstract briefly states the main conclusions/implications of the study. ☐ • The abstract provides a condensed summary of the study without including unnecessary details or references. ☐	
Comments and Suggestions:					
Section/ Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (1/4)	Developing (What is missing) (2.5/4)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (4/4)	Score / 4
Background of the Study		• Not situating the study in the context	• Too detailed definitions and theoretical frameworks that	• The background section clearly identifies the context within which the study is	

The General Introduction				
Problem Statement		☐ No reference to some related studies ☐ Absence of definitions of the key constructs relevant to the study	- should be, instead, discussed in the literature review chapter ☐ - Transition to the problem statement is vague ☐	- conducted (i.e. setting, environment, circumstances, population...etc) ☐ - The background highlights the key theoretical constructs and frameworks relevant to the topic studied. ☐ - The background provides a concise and sufficient overview of the key relevant studies. ☐
	- Too vague and broad problem statement that lacks specificity (i.e. no details about what exactly the problem is, when & where it happened, and who is affected) ☐ - The problem statement includes solutions to the issue being investigated ☐ - The statement contains several unsupported assumptions and makes broad over-generalizations that go beyond the context of the study. ☐ - The section mixes the problem statement with the aims of the study (i.e.; It describes what the researcher will do instead of clearly defining the problem that should be studied.)	- The problem is stated but includes many unnecessary details or jargons that make it difficult for the reader to understand the core issue. ☐ - The problem is stated but overlooks the target population ☐	- The problem is clear, detailed and understandable ☐ - The statement describes the issue that the study addresses in relation to the target population and the context of the study ☐ - The statement provides solid evidence to justify the existence of the problem in the context through factual references of a pilot study ☐	

	☐			
Research Objectives	- The objectives are vague and unclear ☐ - The objectives are not aligned with the problem statement ☐ - The objectives make predictions about the results/conclusions ☐	- The objectives are stated but do not specify the context of the study or the target population ☐ - The objectives are too general ☐ - There is a weak alignment with the problem statement and the research questions (i.e. the objectives do not clearly emerge from the problem statement) ☐	- The Objectives are clear and specific ☐ - The objectives provide details about the target population and context of the study. ☐ - The objectives are realistic and researchable. ☐ - The objectives strongly align with the problem statement and the research questions. ☐	
Research Questions	- The research questions lack precision and are open to various interpretations ☐ - The research questions ask too many things at once. ☐ - The research questions are not aligned with the problem statement or the research objectives ☐ - The research questions contain assumptions about the answer(s) ☐	- The research questions are stated but do not specify the context of the study and the target population ☐ - The research questions are not fully aligned with the problem statement and the research questions. ☐ - The connection between the key variables in the research questions is unclear. ☐	- The research questions are feasible and could be investigated within the available resources, timeframe and researcher's abilities (skills) ☐ - The research questions are focused and narrow. They clearly specify the connection between variables, the setting and target population. ☐ - The research questions fit logically and consistently with the research problem and objectives. ☐	

			• The research questions are neutrally formulated and do not contain any assumptions about the expected outcomes. ☐		
	Research Rationale	• The rationale does not show the research gap to be studied. ☐ • The rationale does not explain how the study contributes to the development of the field of interest. ☐	• The rationale refers to the research gap, but it does not clearly explain how the study fills it. ☐ • The rationale states that the study is original but does not demonstrate how it differs from previous related studies ☐	• The rationale clearly identifies the research gap. ☐ • The rationale clearly demonstrates the originality and value of the research and explains why the problem is worth investigating. ☐	
Comments and Suggestions:					
Section/ Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (1/4)	Developing (What is missing) (2.5/4)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (4/4)	Score/4
		• The literature review merely lists what has been said and done in the field rather than analysing and evaluating the sources reviewed. It looks like a shopping list rather than a coherent and critical discussion.	• The review is more like a list of summaries than an integrated discussion of related sources. ☐ • The review identifies the gap(s), but it does not clearly	• The literature review effectively compares, contrasts, critiques and synthesizes findings from previous studies. ☐ • The literature review effectively justifies the significance of the study through a	/4

The Literature Review Chapter					
	☐ The literature review fails to show the connection/link between the relevant theories/studies and the topic being investigated. ☐ - The literature review fails to identify and explain underlying conceptual/theoretical frameworks that guide the study ☐ - The literature review fails to identify the gap(s) in existing research and does not indicate how the study addresses the gap(s) ☐	- justify the need for conducting the current study. ☐ - The review identifies the theoretical framework, but it does not clearly justify its relevance to the topic under discussion. ☐ - The review mostly relies on outdated and low-quality sources. ☐	- critical identification of the gaps in previous research. ☐ - The chapter clearly explains and justifies the use of a particular theoretical framework or model. ☐ - The literature review includes high-quality and up-to-date sources that reflect current knowledge and latest developments and trends in the field. ☐		
Comments and Suggestions:					
Section/ Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (1/4)	Developing (What is missing) (2.5/4)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (4/4)	Score/4
Research Design	- The research design is not justified (i.e. why it was chosen) ☐ - The research design does not align with the research objectives and the research questions. ☐	- The rationale for the choice of the design is too superficial. ☐ - There is unclear explanation of how the research design helps the researcher meet the research objectives and	- The research design is clearly defined and well-justified. ☐ - The research strongly aligns with the research objectives and the research questions. ☐	Activer Windows Accédez aux paramètres	

The Methodology Chapter				
		answer the research questions. ☐		
Population and Sampling	- The section does not provide details about the sample size, inclusion criteria and procedures ☐ - The sampling technique is not appropriate for the research design ☐	- The target population is identified, but details about its characteristics are not provided ☐ - The sampling procedures are vaguely explained ☐	- Detailed description of the sample and sampling strategies and procedures are provided ☐ - Ethical considerations pertaining to participants and how their rights were protected are well-discussed ☐	
Data Collection Instruments and Procedures	- No details about the research tools and procedures. ☐ - The data collection tools do not align with the research questions ☐	- The data collection tools are briefly described but not well-justified (i.e.; why they are appropriate for the research questions and objectives) ☐ - There is just one research instrument, which reduces the possibility to cross-validate the findings (triangulation) ☐	- A detailed description of the research tools and procedures is provided. ☐ - The data collection instruments strongly align with the research questions ☐	
Data Analysis Instruments and Procedures	- No details about the data analysis tools and procedures. ☐ - The data analysis tools do not align with the nature of the data collected.	The data analysis tools are briefly described but not well-justified (i.e.; why they are appropriate for the	Data analysis tools and procedures are well- explained (e.g.; 1. Qualitative: transcription, coding, thematic interpretation; 2. Quantitative: statistical analysis, etc.) ☐	

		☐	research questions and objectives) ☐	Quantitative: Data entry, descriptive statistics, inferential statistics) ☐ • and align with the nature of the data collected ☐	
	Ethical Considerations/ Research Validity and reliability	• No details about ethical approvals, consent processes or data confidentiality. ☐ • No details about the reliability, validity or piloting of the methods ☐	• The section states that the study followed ethical guidelines, but does not provide details about the process (i.e.; how?) ☐ • The section does not provide sufficient details about the procedures used to ensure validity and reliability ☐	• The section provides a clear and detailed description of the ethical procedures applied ☐ • The section clearly explains how participants' rights were protected (e.g.; privacy, anonymity, confidentiality...) ☐ • The section clearly explains how validity and reliability were ensured (e.g.; pilot testing, expert validation, triangulation, member checking, internal validity... etc) ☐	
Comments and Suggestions:					
Section/Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (1/4)	Developing (What is missing) (2.5/4)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (4/4)	Score/4
	Data Presentation	• Key findings are missing or vaguely presented. ☐ • The results section/chapter includes interpretation and discussion of the findings. ☐	• Tables and figures are used to present data, but they lack clear titles and are not properly referred to in the textual description. ☐	• The results section/chapter effectively fulfills its communicative purpose by clearly presenting the findings without interpretation or discussion. ☐ • The results are clearly structured around	never windows nechez aux paramètres p

The Results and Discussions Chapter				
	The choice of the data display methods does not align with the type of the data presented ☐	- Results are generally clear but occasionally imprecise of incomplete ☐ - Some results do not clearly address the research questions. Some findings are irrelevant or off-topic. ☐ - Occasional interpretations appear in the presentation of some results ☐	- the research objectives and questions (i.e; there is a strong /logical connection between what the aim of the study and what was found). ☐ - The data display methods suit the nature of the data presented. ☐ - Each data display method (e.g.; tables, graphs, charts) is well-labeled, numbered and referenced in the text. ☐ - Each table or graph is followed by a detailed textual description of the data it presents. ☐ - Qualitative results are well-explained and supported with illustrative quotes. ☐	
Data Discussion	- The section/chapter merely repeats the results without explaining what they mean or why they matter. ☐ - The section/chapter reports new findings that were not presented in the results section/chapter. ☐ - The section/chapter ignores the literature and fails to relate the results to the existing knowledge and theories in the field ☐	- Some results are discussed without linking them to the related literature. ☐ - The discussion of some findings involves overgeneralizations that are not supported by the data and do not reflect the scope and context of the study. ☐ - The discussion	- The section/chapter clearly interprets and explains what the results mean, and why they matter. ☐ - The results are well-compared and contrasted with previous studies and theories discussed in the literature review chapter. ☐ - The section/chapter demonstrates a strong alignment between the research findings and the research objectives. ☐	

Pedagogical Implications	• The section/chapter fails to demonstrate how the findings achieved the research objectives and answered the research questions. ☐	• The section/chapter partially addresses the research objectives and questions, but the link is not clearly articulated. ☐	• The section/chapter provides well supported answers to the research questions. ☐	
	• The section fails to connect the implications to the results of the study. ☐ • The implications section does not align with the research scope and methodology. ☐ • The researcher offers suggestions that are unrealistic and not adaptable to the context of the study. ☐	• The section is brief and does not provide sufficient details on the practical applications of the research findings in the educational context (i.e.; how the results influence the teaching and learning practices). ☐ • The majority of the suggested implications are just repetitions of well-known ideas and do not offer original or innovative contributions to the field ☐ • The suggested implications are based on the researcher's personal beliefs and general assumptions rather than being grounded in established theoretical frameworks. ☐	• There is a strong and well-explained link between the suggested implications and the research findings. ☐ • The section provides realistic and context-appropriate strategies for teachers, curriculum designers and policymakers. ☐ • The section offers relevant, innovative and distinctive ideas in their contribution to learning and teaching practices. ☐	Active Windows Accédez aux paramètres

Comments and Suggestions:

Section/ Chapter	Criterion	Needs revision (Issues observed) (0.5/2)	Developing (What is missing) (1.25/2)	Meets expectations (What should be included) (2/2)	Score/ 2
The General Conclusion	Summary and Evaluation of the Study	• The conclusion fails to summarize the main findings and key arguments ☐ • The conclusion introduces new findings or concepts that are not discussed in the body of the dissertation ☐ • The conclusion does not provide a critical evaluation of the study's strengths and weaknesses ☐ • The conclusion neither discusses the limitations nor offer recommendations that address the study's limitations ☐	• The conclusion does restate the main findings but does not clearly show how they are connected to the research questions ☐ • The conclusion just describes the results but does not explain how they contribute to existing knowledge ☐ • The discussion of limitations and recommendations is too general and lacks specificity ☐	• The conclusion provides a clear and concise summary of the key findings ☐ • The conclusion clearly acknowledges the study's limitations and puts forward relevant recommendations for future research ☐ • The conclusion clearly explains what the findings mean in relation to the context, research objectives and questions ☐ • The conclusion effectively highlights the strengths of the study and demonstrates the contribution of the findings to the field of interest ☐	
		Comments and Suggestions:			