|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor = 1 | Fair = 2  | Intermediate = 3 | Good = 4 | Excellent =5 |
| **APA-style:** All but references | Three or more APA style errors in tile page, headings, or page numbers and/or more than 15 minor errors in heading levels or in-text citations.  | Two or more major errors and/or 9-15 minor or repeated errors.  | One or more major errors (e.g., headings, title) and/or 4-8 more minor or repeated errors.  | All elements of the title page are present, page numbers and headings are used. Fewer than four minor errors overall.  | All elements of the title page are present and correct. Page numbers and headings are correct. No errors for in-text citations.  |
| **APA-style:** References | More than 2 major APA style errors plus several minor errors and/or more than 8 or 35% of references not cited in the reference section or text.  | More than 2 major APA style errors, more than 8 minor errors, or more than 4 references not cited in the reference section or text.  | 1-2 major APA style errors (e.g., not using a primary source, citing the wrong source), 4-8 minor errors in reference section, or 2-4 references not cited in the reference section or text.  | Minor and inconsistent (fewer than 4) errors in APA style and/or 1-2 references not cited in the reference section or text.  | All references are in correct APA style, everything is properly cited, and all in-text citations are listed in the reference section and vice versa.  |
| **References** | Includes too many nonscholarly sources or other inappropriate references (e.g., secondary sources). References are old and there are significantly fewer than required | Some references may not be appropriate or appear to have not been read directly. There is not a good mix of classic and recent references, and has fewer references than required.  | References are generally appropriate. Some secondary sources may be included. Fewer references, especially peer reviewed ones, than required.  | References are appropriate. Some key references or areas may be left out. There is a good mix of classic and more recent peer-reviewed research. Has or exceeds required #. | References are appropriate, all or nearly all relevant research is cited and cited correctly, and there is a good mix of classic and more recent peer-reviewed research. Has or exceeds the required number of references.  |
| **Abstract** | More than three elements missing, poorly written, and/or not relevant | Two to three elements are missing or poorly written.  | One element is not present or worded clearly, writing is confusing or not concise, and/or too short or long. | One element (e.g., problem statement, implications) is not present or worded clearly, but otherwise well written, or too short or long.  | Well written, concise, & includes all relevant information (problem statement, hypothesis, sample, method, results, and conclusions/implications) to the proposed study. Within word limit.  |
| **Introduction:** Opening Orientation to the Problem/Issue | No introductory section. | Introduction is not relevant to the current study or does not demonstrate how it is relevant.  | Some relevant introduction, but needs more development and clear links to the current study.  | Interesting and relevant introduction to the topic, but links to the current study are weak and/or the introduction is not as clear or concise as it could be. | Interesting and relevant introduction to the topic with appropriate foreshadowing of the current study.  |
| **Introduction:** Review of relevant literature | Literature is poorly organized and difficult to follow. Several sections of relevant research are missing, and irrelevant research is included.  | Literature is poorly organized so that it is difficult to understand some past research, and topics and key studies are missing.  | Portions of the literature review are irrelevant, or more than 2 topics or key studies are not discussed. | Literature review is mostly well organized and complete, but missing 1-2 topics or key studies. | Complete, concise, and relevant literature review. Main points are clear, well organized, and well documented.  |
| **Introduction:** Theory | No theory is mentioned. | Theory is described incorrectly, in insufficient detail, or is not relevant to the study.  | Theory is described correctly, but may need more detail or clearer links to the study. | Theory is described accurately and adequately, but is not clearly linked to the study.  | Theory is described accurately and adequately and is clearly linked to the study.  |
| **Introduction:** Current study and hypotheses | Study’s purpose is not clear and does not logically relate to the literature review.  | Study’s purpose is not clearly linked to previous research, and more than one hypothesis is unclear or not testable. | Study’s purpose is not clearly linked to previous research, or more than one hypothesis is unclear or not testable.  | Study’s purpose is linked to previous research but a few elements may not be clearly linked. One hypothesis or research question may need more clarification. | Gaps in the current literature clearly and accurately described and linked to current study purpose. Hypotheses or research questions are clear and testable with the proposed study.  |
| **Method:** Participants | Either no sample size is discussed and/or no discussion of how the sample size was selected is present. It is not clear why this sample was chosen or how it will be selected/recruited. | Power analysis is missing or inadequately described/calculated. Reasons for choosing the sample are not clear or the recruitment plan is not clear.  | Power analysis has minor problems and/or there are one to two small questions about the sample selection/recruitment or how they may affect validity.  | Either the effect size for previous research or the power analysis calculation has a minor problem. Selection/recruitment is discussed in practical terms as well as with consideration for internal and external validity.  | The sample size is proposed based on a well presented and correct power analysis. The effect size for previous work is discussed and used in the power analysis. Selection/recruitment is discussed in practical terms as well as with consideration for internal and external validity.  |
| **Method:** Design, Procedure, & Measures | The design does not address the stated hypotheses. The design does not address potential confounds. Operational definitions are poor.  | Design only marginally tests the hypotheses, is not clearly described, lacks controls, contains confounds, and/or has unclear or poorly specified operational definitions. | Design tests the hypotheses but lacks several controls, is inadequately described, and/or does not clearly deal with more than one confound. Reliability and validity of measures not addressed or not clearly linked to study constructs.  | Design tests the hypotheses, but may be missing one to two controls or contain a fixable confound. Reliability or validity of measures not consistently addressed. Sample items provided. | Design is clearly described, clearly tests the stated hypotheses or research questions, contains adequate controls (including manipulation checks), and reduces confounds. Operational definitions are clear and valid. Reliability and validity of measures is addressed and sample items are provided.  |
| **Ethics**  | No discussion of ethical considerations is present, or there is an incorrect discussion of ethical issues. | One large or several minor ethical issues are not addressed or dealt with in the study.  | Two to four ethical issues related to the study are not addressed.  | One minor ethical issue is not addressed adequately.  | Ethical issues are considered and clearly dealt with.  |
| **Planned Analyses:** Data management | Data management plan not appropriate for the proposed study. No discussion of manipulation check data.  | Data management plan is vague or fails to adequately address three of the types of relevant information.  | Data management plan fails to adequately address two of the relevant types of information.  | Data management plan fails to adequately address one of the relevant types of information.  | DMP includes clear and well supported guidelines for exclusion criteria (including tests for outliers), treatment of missing values, data transformations, and attention or manipulation checks.  |
| **Planned Analyses:** Hypothesis testing | No proposed statistical techniques provided for some or most of the hypotheses or research questions.  | Proposed statistical techniques do not clearly relate to the hypotheses and/or cannot be conducted on the study data.  | Proposed statistical techniques would clearly provide an answer for most of the hypotheses or research questions.  | Proposed statistical techniques would clearly provide an answer for the hypotheses or research questions, but some relevant information related to the analyses is missing.  | Proposed statistical techniques would clearly provide an answer for all hypotheses or research questions.  |
| **Discussion:** Limits & future directions | No discussion of limitations or future research.  | Lists less than 2 limitations and 2 ideas for future research, but does have at least one.  | At least 2 limitations and 2 ideas for future research are listed, but they are not discussed and may be common limitations to the area (e.g., college student participants) | At least 2 limitations and 2 ideas for future research are listed, but they are inadequately discussed, or important limitations are not addressed.  | Important limitations to the study are discussed with relevant citations. At least 2 ideas for future research are developed that build on the current study.  |
| **Discussion:** Implications | No discussion of implications. | Implications for theory or practice/society are mentioned, but are not clearly developed or related to the study.  | Implications for theory and practice/society are mentioned, but not clearly developed or related to the study.  | Clear discussion of implications—but only addresses theoretical or practical/societal implications—not both.  | Clear discussion of both theoretical and practical/societal implications of the study.  |
| **Writing style**  | The vast majority of the paragraphs need better topic sentences, research is often discussed in too much detail or is unclear several times, and there are many weak transitions. Tone may be too informal. Many grammatical errors are present, and writing is frequently not precise or concise. Contains errors in paraphrasing or excessive quotations. Very little integration/synthesis of prior research. | Most of the paragraphs need better topic sentences, research is discussed in too much detail or is unclear several times, or there are more than 4 weak transitions. Several grammatical errors are present, and writing is often not precise or concise. May be errors in paraphrasing or excessive quotations. Needs to integrate and synthesize more in several places.  | 10-50% of paragraphs need better topic sentences, research is discussed in too much detail or is unclear 3-5 times, and/or there are 2-4 weak transitions. Several grammatical errors are present, writing is sometimes not precise or concise. May be errors in paraphrasing or excessive quotations. Needs to integrate and synthesize more in some places.  | Fewer than 10% of paragraphs need better topic sentences, research is discussed in too much or unclear detail less than 3 times, or 2 or fewer weak transitions. Grammar is good, writing is precise and concise, and paraphrasing is used correctly. Generally integrates and synthesizes prior research well.  | Good topic sentences. Sufficient but not overly detailed descriptions of research, implications and transitions are clear. Grammar is excellent, and writing is precise and concise. Paraphrasing is used correctly. Integrates and synthesizes prior research very well.  |