

## ASSESSING ACADEMIC AND DISCIPLINARY LITERACIES: A CROSS-DISCIPLINARY AND MULTILINGUAL RUBRIC

This document presents the final version of a rubric designed to assess students' academic and disciplinary literacies (ADLs) in three dimensions: two cognitive discourse functions (argue and compare) and source-based writing.

The rubric was constructed through an expert judgement procedure for a doctoral dissertation. The rubric is thought of as a cross-disciplinary and multilingual tool, i.e., it can be used and applied to different disciplines and languages. Although the intended task includes all three dimensions, the rubric can also be used to assess these independently.

—

Some terms in the rubric need to be clarified before use:

- **Accurate:** producing correct language forms following the linguistic norms of the target language, i.e., no errors (Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998).
- **Appropriate:** the correct use of a linguistic resource according to its function within a context (Nikula et al., 2016).
- **Complex/simple:** related to the sophistication (depth) of the linguistic structures (syntactic and lexical) employed by the writer (Lu, 2017).
- **Varied:** related to the size (diversity) of the linguistic structures (syntactic and lexical) employed by the student (Lu, 2017), i.e., lack of repetition of structures.
- **Relevant:** use of information or ideas that are connected to the main purpose of the text (Leki & Carson, 1997; Macagno, 2016).

D1: ARGUE					
ITEM	DEFINITION	0 - Inexistent, poor	1 - Fair	2 - Good	3 - Excellent
<b>Stance-taking (D1_ST)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to express their claim or position towards the topic and take a stance.</i>	The writer's stance towards the topic is not stated, or it is not consistent throughout the text.	The writer's stance towards the topic is difficult to discern, as it is implied.	The writer's stance towards the topic is presented explicitly and is mostly clear.	The writer's stance towards the topic is presented explicitly, clearly and accurately.
<b>Reasoning (D1_R)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to provide supporting data and warrants to justify their stance.</i>	The writer does not produce data to support their stance or the data is irrelevant, incorrect and/or contradictory.	The writer produces accurate data to support their stance, but it is not elaborated on or not directly linked to their stance.	The writer produces accurate and relevant data to support their stance, and it is elaborated on and/or explicitly linked to their stance.	The writer elaborates on accurate and relevant data to support their stance, including warrants and/or examples for justification purposes.
<b>Counterargumen- tation and rebuttal (D1_CR)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to acknowledge and refute opposing views to their claim, by providing counterarguments and rebuttals based on data.</i>	The writer does not mention, acknowledge, or recognise opposing views.	The writer acknowledges that opposing views exist, but does not produce counterarguments based on data.	The writer produces accurate and relevant counterarguments, but they are not rebutted or critiqued.	The writer produces accurate and relevant counterarguments, explicitly rebutting and/or critiquing opposing views.
<b>Language for arguing (D1_LA)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to use appropriate, accurate and varied lexicogrammatical resources to produce argumentation elements, including connectives, words to express cause and effect, evaluative language, modalisation...</i>	The writer does not use lexicogrammatical resources to produce argumentation elements, or uses them incorrectly.	The writer uses minimal lexicogrammatical resources to produce argumentation elements, and/or their use might not be completely accurate and/or appropriate.	The writer uses lexicogrammatical resources to produce argumentation elements appropriately and accurately, but they are mostly simple and not varied.	The writer appropriately and accurately uses a variety of simple and complex lexicogrammatical resources to produce argumentation elements.

<b>D2: COMPARE</b>					
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>0 - Inexistent, poor</b>	<b>1 - Fair</b>	<b>2 - Good</b>	<b>3 - Excellent</b>
<b>Comparative items (D2_CI)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to produce comparisons between the two concepts, by including differences and/or similarities, and elaborating on them.</i>	The writer does not compare the two concepts.	The writer partly compares the two concepts by mentioning some similarities and/or differences.	The writer clearly compares the two concepts by mentioning similarities and/or differences.	The writer clearly compares the two concepts by equally elaborating on several similarities and/or differences among the concepts.
<b>Comparative criteria (D2_CC)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to explicitly express the comparative criteria, i.e., the bases of comparison (the criterion according to which the similarities/differences are being made).</i>	The writer does not produce a clear criterion for comparisons.	The writer produces comparisons based on a criterion, but it is not explicitly stated.	The writer explicitly states the criteria for comparisons.	The writer explicitly states and elaborates on relevant criteria for comparisons.
<b>Comparative structure (D2_CS)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to organise the comparisons logically, at sentence, paragraph and text levels.</i>	The writer does not present structured comparisons throughout the text.	The writer presents comparisons that are somewhat logically structured.	The writer presents point-by-point comparisons that are logically and appropriately structured.	The writer presents point-by-point comparisons that are logically structured at sentence, paragraph and text levels.
<b>Language for comparing (D2_LC)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to use appropriate, accurate and varied lexicogrammatical resources to produce comparisons, including compare/contrast connectives, lexical and grammatical forms to express difference/similarity, juxtapositions...</i>	The writer does not use lexicogrammatical resources to produce comparisons, or uses them incorrectly.	The writer uses minimal lexicogrammatical resources to produce comparisons, and/or their use might not be completely accurate and/or appropriate.	The writer uses some lexicogrammatical resources to produce comparisons appropriately and accurately, but they are mostly simple and not varied.	The writer appropriately and accurately uses a variety of simple and complex lexicogrammatical resources to produce comparisons.

D3: SBW					
ITEM	DEFINITION	0 - Inexistent, poor	1 - Fair	2 - Good	3 - Excellent
<b>Use and comprehension of sources (D3_UC)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to convey their comprehension of the sources through the use of sources accurately in a relevant way.</i>	The writer's text presents indicators of serious comprehension problems, or does not use the source at all.	The writer's text presents (little) information from sources somewhat relevant to the task, but there are major inaccuracies in conveying information from the sources.	The writer's text presents some information from sources relevant to the task, but there are minor inaccuracies in conveying details from the sources.	The writer's text presents substantial information from sources always relevant to the task, and details are accurately presented.
<b>Degree of transformation (D3_DT)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to transform the information from the sources via paraphrasing (lexical and structural changes).</i>	The writer copies most information directly from the source and makes minimal or no linguistic changes.	The writer copies most information directly from the source, but there is some linguistic change.	The writer integrates information from the source by mostly paraphrasing with lexical or structural changes.	The writer accurately integrates information from the source by transforming it with both lexical and structural changes.
<b>Inclusion of original ideas (D3_O)</b>	<i>This is defined as the writer's ability to include ideas not present in the sources, (original ideas from the writer's background) by appropriately integrating external knowledge into the text.</i>	The writer does not include external information.	The writer includes some external information, but it is not appropriately integrated with source information.	The writer includes some external information in the text and it is mostly well integrated with information from the sources.	The writer includes some external information in the text and it is always appropriately integrated with information from the sources.