



## ABSTRACTS CATEGORISATION GUIDE

The abstract categorisation guide is given below.

Rating/Categorisation	Categorisation Guide
<b>Accept without change</b>	<p>The abstract is clear, concise, and excellently written. The focus is clearly articulated through well designed research questions (RQs). The methodology is stated and in line with the RQs. Findings are succinctly summarised with clearly established outcomes for either theoretical frames or practical implications.</p> <p>In case of an industry-based project, the submission gives a clear indication of the nature of the problem it sought to address, the practical protocol for design and implementation is described and offers a robust frame for research or evaluative outcomes.</p>
<b>Accept with minor change</b>	<p>The abstract is clear, concise, and generally well written. There may be some minor linguistic inaccuracies but these do not blur meaning. The focus and RQs are clear enough. The methodology is linked the RQs and considered to be appropriate. Research outcomes are stated and their implications discussed with clarity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the project located within a more practical context is clearly described and its procedures detailed out in a way to afford confidence about its technical soundness. Findings/ outcomes are articulated in a manner deemed appropriate to the area of research/ practice being targeted.</p>
<b>Accept with major changes</b>	<p>Some sections of the abstract may be stronger than others although the general focus and RQs are identifiably sound. The abstract may require editing to more clearly communicate intentions and outcomes to a scientific audience. Some more information on the methodology may be required to</p>

**Tertiary Education Commission**

Phone: (230) 467 8800, Fax: (230) 467 6579



## ABSTRACTS CATEGORISATION GUIDE

	<p>afford more clarity on the research design and process. Findings are presented but these may need to be more cogently linked to both the RQs and the inferences made.</p> <p>In case of an industry-based project, the abstract may require additional work to convert a practice driven project into its corollary scientific format. There is however a recognition the scientific processes underpinning the technical design are sound and of value to the scientific community. Outcomes are discussed but perhaps need to be more focused and more clearly articulated</p>
<b>Reject</b>	<p>The abstract does not adhere to the standard format expected of a scientific presentation. The scientific contribution is not established either on account of inadequate framing as a knowledge/ practice problem. The methodological/ technical processes are unclear as are the outcomes of the research/ practice-based project. Language used is not helpful in achieving the required minimum its terms of clarity of meaning.</p>