**222: Paper 1 Rubric – What we look for**

**(TOTAL = 75 points)**

**APA-Style Formatting**

* Paper has 1” margins all-around; Double-spaced throughout
* Typed in TimesNewRoman 12-point font
* Includes a proper APA-style running head (see APA manual)
* Title is centered at top (not the word “Introduction.”)
* Typing starts on the *next* double-spaced line (using normal paragraphs).
* Subsections / headings are in correct APA-Style
* There are many more details here to attend to such as citations are typed accurately, statistical symbols, all references, etc.

*Points (7 = about 10%)*

*(Continued)*

**Introduction** *(See Class/Lab Manual!!!, Kail chps. 1, 3, 4, 5, feedback on draft, Heath, other sample documents on Moodle, articles you have read for your paper)*

**Opening Paragraph(s) (The Frame or Hook)** – Remember – do this after you’ve written some.

* Opens the paper broadly, but not overly so. It’s a meaningful, interesting hook, not a throw-away sentence.
* Within the first paragraph, one gets a *general* sense of the focus of the paper. You do not need details here, but the reader should understand that the paper is likely about competitiveness and aggressive driving.

**The Supporting Details: Review of the Relevant Literature (Main Body of Introduction)**

* Overall, the introduction gives the reader a clear sense of the most important past research conducted on the topic
* Order of the coverage of articles is *based on the ideas they represent* and not merely one article after another
* Previous research is described using *synthesis and analysis*
* Previous research is well connected to each other and eventually to your hypotheses
* *Each paragraph focus is on ideas*, not the research article itself (see writing section below)
* Transitions: The topics covered are interrelated such that they form a cohesive story
  + Has transitions between paragraphs that link the last idea in the previous paragraph to the first idea in the next paragraph (i.e., there is an explicit connection between the ideas).
* No superfluous information: There are not any articles that do not fit well with your topic nor are they details of studies described that are not relevant.
* The review makes it seem as though the majority of previous literature naturally points to your study as the next logical step
* The organization follows a theme of going from general to progressively more specific topics.
* The order and organization of your articles funnel toward (naturally lead to) your specific topic/hypotheses.
* Significance of the research is clearly identified (how it adds to or builds upon previous research). *In other words, what gap is your research intended to fill?*

**Concluding Paragraph(s)**

* Paper has a short paragraph just before the hypotheses explicitly linking past literature to the current research.
* Makes a connection between what you think will happen (hypotheses) and why you think it will happen (basis for this provided by review of relevant literature).

**Hypotheses**

* *You MUST have a hypothesis.*
* Must preview your methods *just enough* for your hypothesis to be understandable to someone who has no idea of your methods yet. Details are not needed here – save those for the procedure section.
* Explains why you expected results that would support the hypotheses.
* Hypotheses are stated in a clear and specific manner. Hypotheses make clear predictions about how you think the independent and dependent variables would relate to each other.
* All relevant constructs were clearly defined
* Written in past tense

*Points (25 = about 33% of the total points)*

*(Continued)*

**Method Section** *(See sample papers, Heath text, lab manual, your articles)*

* Has *at least* two subsections – Participants and Procedure

Participants

* + How Ps were recruited, their basic demographics, and how they were compensated is clear.
  + If Ps were removed from the study, it can appear here (but can appear elsewhere instead – in the results, for example).
  + Superfluous details are minimal or eliminated (e.g., names of a building, “PY101”, etc.)

Procedure

* + Written primarily from Ps point of view ***(active-voice- what Ps did, not what they were asked to do)***
  + Organized in a relatively liner fashion, from the beginning to the end of the procedure
  + All stimuli or measures are described in detail (how many, how were they presented, obtained from where, etc.)
  + All measured are described (how many items, give an example or two (but don’t list them all here – you can in an appendix if you like), in what order, from where di they come – cite source, etc.)
  + All methodological details are described (e.g., if applicable: random assignment, type of design, number of DVs, the DVs themselves, the IVs, how many trials (if relevant), etc.)
  + Superfluous details are minimal or eliminated

*Points (20 = about 27%)*

**Results Section *(See Kail, ch. 6, Lab manual, Heath text, sample papers, etc.)***

* Describe how the data were coded (e.g., were items reverse scored, was a reliability analysis conducted, was a composite variable created, etc.)
* Describe any data that was eliminated from the analyses and why
* Remind the reader of your conceptual hypotheses right before you describe the analysis that tests it
* Always describe in words your results, including the direction of the effects
* Don't forget to include 95% Cis and effect sizes
* If you conducted analyses other than those related to your hypotheses, identify them as exploratory
* Don't forget to include data from your manipulation check *if* you have one. (It may work better in another section such as your method section, or it may work best here – depends on how you've; ordered your writing).
* Correctly type scale anchors. (e.g., 1-*Strongly Agree* to 7-*Strongly Disagree*.)

*Points (6 = 8%)*

**Discussion Section** *(See Kail, ch. 7, Heath text, your articles, and the lab manual – specifically)* *See lab manual on how to write discussions, as there is a slight difference from what Kail tells us to do.*

* **For PAPER#1, you do not need to do all of this. Two paragraphs or so will work. I’d do at least the first two below and then a brief conclusion.**
* Opening paragraph briefly summarizes the results in a non-numerical manner considering your hypotheses
* *How* does what you found relate to (connect with) what we already know from the existing literature? Be specific here, don't just say your results are or are not consistent with X. *Tell the reader how so*.
* Do your results have implications for existing theory? Or do they imply something for the practical world (don’t over do it with that).
* *Discuss* limitations of your study, but focus on larger ones, not every minute thing. For example, insufficient sample size is not something of importance especially when you have statistically significant results UNLESS the study was underpowered. Likewise, don’t harp the generalizability of your results too much. A brief mention is fine, but that’s not really a limitation because could not have done anything about it anyway – it’s just a caution to the reader). As you discuss limitations, offer ways for future research to correct those limitations.

*Points (4 = about 5%)*

**General Writing** *(See Kail chps. 1, 3, 4, Lan manual, Heath, your articles)*

* **Avoids using quotes (except where 100% necessary).**
* Paragraphs are about one and only one idea.
* Each paragraph contains a clear thesis (a topic sentence with controlling idea) – **See Kail, ch. 4**
* Each paragraph contains clear supporting statements about the one thesis/topic idea.
* There are clear transitions within paragraphs, linking one idea to the next
* There are clear transitions between paragraphs, logically building from one paragraph’s main idea to set up the next paragraph’s main idea
* Clear, precise, economical use of language
* No grammatical or punctuation errors

*Points (13 = about 15%)*

**Total** *(out of 75 points):*