

RUBRIC FOR I.S. RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY

APA Style: The thesis is expected to conform to APA requirements for style and format.

INTRODUCTION

Criteria	1 Not addressed	2 Some attention to criterion	3 Moderate level of achievement	4 Good level of achievement	5 Outstanding level of achievement
<u>Context</u>	Importance of the question is not addressed. How the question relates to the broader theories and issues in psychology is not addressed.	The writer provides a generic or vague rationale for the importance of the question. The writer provides a generic or vague reference to the broader context of psychology.	The writer provides some explanation of the importance of the question. The writer provides some relevant context for the research question(s).	The writer provides a good explanation of the importance of the question. The writer provides a good level of relevant context for the research question(s) but lacks a clear understanding of the big picture.	The writer provides a complete explanation of the importance/ interest of the question. The writer provides an outstanding level of relevant context for the research question(s) and has a clear understanding of the big picture.
<u>Accuracy and Relevance</u>	Background information is missing or contains major inaccuracies.	Background omits some information or contains inaccuracies that detract noticeably from the major ideas of the Introduction.	Background information contains inaccuracies that detract somewhat from the major ideas of the Introduction.	Background information contains minor omissions or inaccuracies that do not detract seriously from the major ideas of the Introduction.	Background information is completely accurate (i.e., theoretical and historical sources) and has the appropriate level of specificity to provide concise and useful context to aid the reader's understanding.

Criteria	1 Not addressed	2 Some attention to criterion	3 Moderate level of achievement	4 Good level of achievement	5 Outstanding level of achievement
<u>Accuracy and Relevance (cont.)</u>	Background information is accurate, but irrelevant or too disjointed to make relevance clear. Primary literature references are absent or irrelevant.	Background information is overly narrow or overly general (only partially relevant). Primary literature references, if present, are inadequately explained.	Background information is somewhat narrow or too general (partially relevant). Primary literature references are sometimes inadequately explained.	Background information has the appropriate level of specificity to provide relevant context. Primary literature references are adequately explained. References are perhaps too few in number.	Primary literature references are relevant (i.e., empirical research papers are directly relevant to the current study). Primary literature references are thoroughly explained, and indicate a comprehensive lit. search.
<u>Analysis and Integration</u>	Alternative explanations/contradictory evidence not considered. Article summaries are few, not well-written, or not integrated or analyzed critically. Serious factual errors, misconceptions, or misinterpretations are evident.	Alternative explanations/contradictory evidence considered in a very limited way. Article summaries are adequate, but not integrated or approached critically. Some factual errors, misconceptions, or misinterpretations are apparent.	Alternative explanations/contradictory evidence considered to some extent, but only to some degree. Literature review shows some breadth and depth, but is only somewhat integrative and critically addressed. Few factual errors, misconceptions, or misinterpretations are apparent.	Alternative explanations/contradictory evidence considered adequately. Literature review moves well beyond mere summaries, and includes good level of comparison, evaluation and integration. No factual errors, misconceptions or misinterpretations are evident.	Alternative explanations/contradictory evidence is thoroughly presented and integrated. Literature review shows integration, comparison of findings, and critical insight involving evaluation of sources. Moves beyond mere article summaries to include comparison, evaluation and integration of findings and ideas. No factual errors, misconceptions, or misinterpretations are apparent.

Criteria	1 Not addressed	2 Some attention to criterion	3 Moderate level of achievement	4 Good level of achievement	5 Outstanding level of achievement
<u>Analysis and Integration (cont.)</u>	Serious weaknesses in reasoning. Uses little or no evidence to support ideas.	Some weaknesses in reasoning. Uses little, incomplete, or inaccurate evidence to support ideas.	Few weaknesses in reasoning; some weakness in use of evidence to support ideas.	No serious weaknesses in reasoning; only minor weakness in use of evidence to support ideas.	No weaknesses in reasoning; excellent use of evidence to support ideas. Shows sound logic and critical analysis.
<u>Organization and Development</u>	Ideas are difficult to follow. Most sections are disconnected, with no or poor transitions, disorganized paragraphs, and arguments that are hard to follow. Shows no development of ideas and arguments toward main theme(s) of the research.	Basic organization is appropriate, but several sections are disconnected, lacking transitions and/or focus, and hard to follow. Shows weak and inadequate development of ideas toward main theme(s) of research.	Basic organization is appropriate but some sections are disconnected, lacking in focus and hard to follow. Shows some development of ideas and arguments toward main theme(s) of the research.	Minor weaknesses in organization; lacking some coherence between sections, or discernable movement toward proposed research. Shows good development of ideas and arguments toward main theme(s) of the research.	Pattern of organization is logical and easy to follow, with clear subheadings and coherent subsections, with literature review showing discernable arc toward the investigator's proposed research. Shows outstanding development of ideas and arguments toward main theme(s) of the research.
<u>Problem Statement, Hypotheses</u>	No clear statement of problem is presented. No hypothesis is stated, or stated hypothesis is incorrect, off-topic, or untestable.	Problem is not clearly stated. Hypothesis is weak, implausible, or trivial. Hypothesis does not emerge clearly from literature review.	Problem is adequately stated. States a single relevant, testable hypothesis, with only the absence of that finding as an alternative result.	Problem is clearly stated. Multiple relevant, testable hypotheses are clearly stated. Hypotheses address more than one potential mechanism, explanation, or factor.	Clear problem statement is presented. Comprehensive set of testable hypotheses is clearly stated. Hypotheses distinguish among multiple major factors or potential explanations.

No originality of problem or hypothesis is evident.

Hypothesis taken directly from other sources.

Hypothesis shows some originality, with some level of understanding beyond ideas apparent in other sources.

Hypotheses are original and show good grasp of logic and ideas beyond those already explicated in the current literature.

Hypotheses are novel, insightful, and have strong potential to contribute useful new knowledge.

METHOD

Criterion	1 Not Addressed	2 Some Attention to Criterion	3 Moderate Level of Achievement	4 Good Level of Achievement	5 Outstanding Achievement
<u>Organization and Design</u>	<p>Contains many unnecessary descriptions of procedures.</p> <p>Pattern of organization is difficult to follow.</p> <p>Student uses incorrect or inappropriate headers.</p> <p>Student designs a poor research project with inappropriate variables or inability to evaluate data set.</p>	<p>Contains a number of unnecessary and disruptive descriptions of procedures.</p> <p>Pattern of organization is difficult to follow at times.</p> <p>Student has a number of distracting errors with headings, or lack of headings.</p> <p>Student shows multiple problems with research purpose and audience. Major weaknesses in ability to evaluate data statistically. Bias, confounds, OR inappropriately small sample sizes, OR inappropriate variables selected.</p>	<p>Contains some unnecessary descriptions of procedures.</p> <p>Pattern of organization is generally easy to follow. Presents some sequential information in a disorganized, difficult pattern.</p> <p>Student has some problems with headings.</p> <p>Student selects variables that are appropriate for the research purpose and audience. Research is designed to allow appropriate statistical analysis, but research is weakened by bias, confounds, or small sample size.</p>	<p>Good level of detail, but contains minor unnecessary descriptions of procedures.</p> <p>Very good organization is the general pattern.</p> <p>Student has only minor problems with headings.</p> <p>Design is good in purpose and audience. Bias and confounds are well minimized. Appropriate sample size used. Data are suitable for appropriate statistical analyses.</p>	<p>Does not contain unnecessary descriptions of procedures.</p> <p>Pattern of organization makes it easy to follow. Presents sequential information in appropriate chronology.</p> <p>Uses appropriate headings to guide the reader.</p> <p>Student selects variables that are appropriate for research purpose and audience. Demonstrates ability to eliminate bias and minimize potential confounds. Appropriate sample size. Good design for statistical analyses. Superior research project.</p>

<u>Appropriate Level of Detail for Replication</u>	Describes the experiment so poorly or in such a nonspecific way that it cannot be replicated and lacks explication of operational definitions.	Presents an experiment that is marginally replicable, where parts of the basic design must be inferred, and fails to construct a comprehensive operational definition.	Lacks some major methodological information OR presents only an implied comprehensive operational definition and some specific operational definitions.	Good overall level of detail, but does not present enough detail in secondary or minor methodologies for complete replication.	Contains effective, quantifiable, concisely organized information that allows the experiment to be replicated. Student constructs stated comprehensive operational definitions and well-developed specific operational definitions.
---	--	--	---	--	---

RESULTS

Criterion	1 Not Addressed	2 Some Attention to Criterion	3 Moderate Level of Achievement	4 Good Level of Achievement	5 Outstanding Achievement
<u>Data Analysis</u>	There is no attempt to summarize or evaluate the data and only raw data are reported.	Data are not analyzed beyond the descriptive level; inferential statistics are not performed or are performed incorrectly.	Some analyses may not be appropriate for the research question or analyses may not have been properly performed; descriptive statistics may be adequate, but inferential statistics are inadequate.	Choice of methods of summarizing and analyzing data are appropriate for the data, and for answering the fundamental research question; statistical analyses are performed properly; data analysis may be incomplete: basic analyses are done, but some important follow-up or post hoc analyses are not performed; analyses, though correct, are lacking in thoroughness.	A clear description of the data and statistical methods employed is provided. Methods of summarizing and analyzing the data are ideal for the hypotheses of the I.S. and the data collected. Data analysis is complete and thorough. Analyses are performed and reported properly.
	Graphs/tables are missing or wholly inadequate for purposes of presenting the findings of the study; if present, graphs/tables have	Graphs/tables do not clearly or effectively present the results; captions, labels or legends are missing or inappropriate; too much or too little	Captions, labels or legends may be partly inadequate or missing; an inappropriate type of graph may be used for the specific type of variable used; graphs may be too	Figures and tables are appropriate, but do not present the results in a completely clear way; captions, labels, or legends are not completely descriptive of what is	Figures and tables are clear and effectively represent the findings of the study; the graphs/tables are effectively captioned and labeled and have

been prepared or drawn incompletely or carelessly.

information is presented in the graphs or tables; graphs/tables are sloppy and appear to have been prepared in a haphazard manner.

“busy,” or have too much wasted space; size of graph as prepared is inappropriate (too small or too large) for the circumstances; graphs/tables are adequate but could have clearer visual appeal.

displayed on the graph/table; graph/table may be difficult to interpret; graphs may be lacking in visual appeal.

descriptive legends; graphs/tables are visually appealing and readily understood.

DISCUSSION

Criteria	1 Not addressed	2 Some Attention to Criterion	3 Moderate Level of Achievement	4 Good Level of Achievement	5 Outstanding Achievement
<u>Summarizing Main Findings</u>	<p>Student does not address the purpose, hypotheses, or main findings of the research.</p> <p>Student does not draw inferences from the data or draws grossly inappropriate inferences from the data.</p>	<p>Student attempts to address the purpose, hypotheses, and main findings of the research, but is significantly lacking in one or more of these areas.</p> <p>Student has pronounced difficulty drawing inferences that are consistent with the data and scientific reasoning, and/or has moderate difficulty communicating these to the audience.</p>	<p>Student provides an adequate but somewhat vague summary of purpose, hypotheses, and main findings of the research.</p> <p>Student draws inferences that are only somewhat consistent with the data and scientific reasoning and/or has moderate difficulty communicating these to the audience.</p>	<p>Student provides a generally clear and concise summary of the purpose, hypotheses, and main findings of the research with some minor flaws.</p> <p>Student draws inferences that are generally consistent with the data and scientific reasoning and has only minor difficulty communicating these to the audience.</p>	<p>Student provides a clear and concise summary of the purpose, hypotheses, and main findings of the research.</p> <p>Student draws clear inferences that are logically consistent with the data and scientific reasoning and effectively communicates these to the audience.</p>

<u>Implications of Findings</u>	<p>Student does not present data honestly and/or accurately, does not distinguish between fact and implication, and/or grossly overgeneralizes.</p> <p>Student does not place research findings within the broader field of the study (i.e., things reviewed in the introduction).</p>	<p>Student has pronounced difficulty presenting data honestly and/or accurately, has difficulty distinguishing between fact and implication, and/or shows tendency to overgeneralize.</p> <p>Student attempts to place research findings within the broader field of study (i.e., things reviewed in the introduction), but has pronounced difficulty doing so.</p>	<p>Student generally presents data honestly and accurately, but has some difficulty in distinguishing between fact and implication and/or overgeneralizes.</p> <p>Student attempts to place research findings within the broader field of study (i.e., things reviewed in the introduction), but has moderate difficulty doing so.</p>	<p>Student mainly presents data honestly and accurately, typically distinguishing between fact and implication, and avoids overgeneralizing.</p> <p>Student attempts to place research findings within the broader field of study (i.e., things reviewed in the introduction) with only minor difficulty.</p>	<p>Student presents data honestly and accurately, distinguishing between fact and implication, and avoids overgeneralizing.</p> <p>Student attempts to place research findings within the broader field of study (i.e., things they reviewed in the introduction).</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

Criteria	1 Not addressed	2 Some Attention to Criterion	3 Moderate Level of Achievement	4 Good Level of Achievement	5 Outstanding Achievement
<u>Limitations and Future Directions</u>	<p>Student does not outline potential methodological flaws of the study.</p> <p>Student does not offer explanations for unexpected results and/or suggestions for future research.</p>	<p>Student attempts to outline potential methodological flaws of the study, but does so sparsely and/or ineffectively.</p> <p>Student offers limited explanations for unexpected results and/or suggestions for future research.</p>	<p>Student attempts to outline potential methodological flaws in the study, and is partially successful in doing so.</p> <p>Student offers adequate explanations for unexpected results and some suggestions for future research.</p>	<p>Student does a good job outlining potential methodological flaws of the study.</p> <p>Student offers reasonable explanations for unexpected results and good suggestions for future research.</p>	<p>Student articulately explains potential methodological flaws of the study in an outstanding way.</p> <p>Student offers insightful explanations for unexpected results and unusually strong suggestions for future research.</p>

OVERALL

Independence and Initiative in I.S. Research

Despite deadlines and guidance from advisor, student failed to complete work in a satisfactory and untimely manner.

Student required multiple reminders and strong external guidance regarding the direction of the thesis.

Student showed moderate initiative, demonstrating independent thought and effort on parts of the thesis but requiring lots of external guidance on other parts.

Student demonstrated good initiative and worked well within a framework generated in consultation with advisor.

Student demonstrated strong initiative, generated his or her own goals, questions and deadlines, and responded well to guidance.