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Structure of Paper by Headings:

Introduction
Text...

Summary of Article 1

Purpose/Background. Text...
Method. Text...
Results. Text...
Author Interpretations. Text...

Summary of Article 2 (see subsection headings for Article 1)
Summary of Article 3 (see subsection headings for Article 1)

Integration
Text...

References

Grading:

Organization (20 pts.)
• The paper should have five major sections: Introduction, Summary of Article 1, Summary of Article 2, Summary of Article 3, and Integration
  • The introduction sets up the article summaries and integration section
  • The article summaries present research that will be used in the integration section
  • The integration section provides a synthesis of that research in a way that presents logical, coherent support for the main point that was stated in the introduction
• Structure: Does the paper have a clear structure? Do the sections and information flow in a coherent manner? Is it easy to follow what’s going on in the paper, or does it just seem to ramble from one topic to another, or from one finding to another without apparent reason?
• Introduction: (1) Does the intro clearly state the main point(s) of the paper? (2) Does the intro describe (very briefly) how the paper will address the main points (e.g., by summarizing the main point or approach of each of the three articles)? (3) Does the intro present a very brief background of those main points?

Summaries of Articles (45 pts.)
• Note: Each paper is to be based on 3 articles. Each summary is worth 15 points. The summary of each article should be written as a stand-alone summary and should be graded separately
• Each article summary should present four kinds of information (presented in this order):
  • Purpose/background: Are the main purpose or purposes of the article/study stated clearly? Is the theoretical and/or research background presented?
  • Method: Are the methods (participants, measures, etc.) summarized clearly and succinctly? Are the key measures mentioned? Are they briefly explained? Is the information presented here used in the results section? (There’s a balance between writing in too much detail and not enough.)
  • In the case of a meta-analysis, are the main bodies of research clearly articulated?
  • Results: Are the results summarized clearly and succinctly? Are the results presented here used in the summary of author interpretations? (Again, the balance between too much and too little detail.)
  • Author interpretations (found in the “Discussion” section of the article): Are these summarized in a way that makes clear sense of the results?
Notes on what kind of information to include in each section
• Each article summary should present only information that is relevant to the Integration section, and thus to the main point of the paper
• The only methods that should be presented are those that relate directly to the results that are presented
• The only results that should be presented are those that relate directly to the author interpretations and the overall integration section
• Grading each article summary in a holistic manner: Stepping back from the above details, what is your intuitive sense for the overall presentation of this article? Does this intuitive assessment match the point-by-point assessment? If not, adjust accordingly

Integration of Articles (25 pts.)
• Does the integration section provide convincing support of the paper’s main point?
  • Does the integration of the articles incorporate the findings of all three articles?
  • Is the integration accurately represent the findings of all three articles, as those findings were presented earlier? In other words, is the integration consistent with the summaries?
  • Does the integration section read reasonably, taking account of scientific findings yet acknowledging gaps in knowledge and directions for future research, or does it come across like a sales pitch or an advocacy essay?
• Are personal interpretations/opinions based on the findings, or do the interpretations go off on a tangent or express ideas that really have nothing to do with the findings? If the latter, then is it a matter of simply refuting the research or just being incoherent? If refuting, is a logical argument presented?

Quality of References (5 pts.)
• Did the articles appear in peer-reviewed journals?
• Are the articles based on empirical research? If it’s a meta-analysis, does it translate statistics from various articles into a common metric?
• Are copies of the abstract of each article attached to the back of the student’s paper?

APA style for citations and references (5 pts.)
• Note: The following are some basics for citations and references in APA style. Examples can be downloaded from my website
  • Citations
    • You must cite a reference (an article, book, or book chapter):
      • whenever you use information that you found in a reference that is not common knowledge (e.g., the findings of a study; the description of a theory; observations of something that you did not know)
      • whenever you quote words directly from the text of a reference
        • here you must use quotation marks around the words taken directly from text
      • whenever you paraphrase an author’s statements: when paraphrasing, be extremely careful that you are not just substituting one or two words for the author’s words but rather are putting the author’s ideas into your own words
    • Failure to use quotation marks and citations properly is a serious offense called plagiarism
  • References
    • A reference section (called: References) should appear at the end
      • See sample sheet (distributed in class) for ways to format the reference section
    • Every reference listed in the reference section must be cited at least once in the paper
    • Every citation in the paper must refer to a reference listed in the reference section