Psychology Literature Review Marking Rubric for PS103 and PS206 2015 – RSD Framework

Section, Facet of Research &	Advanced >78%	Effective 64-77%	Less Effective 50-63%	Unsatisfactory <50%	No Evidence
Weighting	2/8%	04-77%			(0)
Title Page [Communicate & Apply Ethically] 2.5%	Has a running header (RH). All relevant parts (student name & ID, Course Code, Course Coordinators name, Assignment number, Number of words) of the title page are included. Title includes variables & some articulation of relationships.	All relevant parts of the title page are included. Title/RH is appropriate but may not be very concise.	Title/RH does not effectively convey all the variables in the study OR does not include a RH. Two other important elements are missing.	Title/RH is not appropriate OR not included. Three other important elements are missing.	
Abstract [Organise & Manage all elements in a succinct format.] 10%	Abstract includes a succinct summary of research question (RQ), variables, major results, & implications/limitations of those results. Is within the word limit.	Abstract is missing essential information from one paper section and/or lacks clarity due to poor sentence structure. Is within the word limit.	Abstract is missing essential information from two paper sections. Some information may be incorrect or unclear. Is 10% above the word limit.	Abstract does not accurately summarise the content. Three or more important elements are missing. Is significantly above or less than word limit (10% difference).	
Introduction [Embark & Clarify - Significance of topic, definitions & RQ/Aim] 20%	Starts on a new page with a centred heading. Repeats the title of the paper. Begins in a broad manner. Outlines the significance of the topic, main arguments & defines key terms. RQ /aims are clearly articulated, interrelated & follow a logical sequence.	Title is not centred or does not begin on a new page. Repeats the title of the paper. Starts somewhat broadly & provides some significance of topic. An explanation of the key terms is provided & RQ are articulated, but it could be clearer.	Incorrect title. Does not adequately outline the significance. Two important elements are vague or missing.	Incorrect or missing title Does not adequately outline the significance. Three or more important elements are vague or missing.	
Body [Find & Generate relevant & credible literature] 5%	Conducts thorough search process identifying credible & relevant literature.	Literatures identified address all RQ & variables but some literature are not credible.	Literature identified do not address all RQ & variables & some literature is not credible.	Most Literature identified are not relevant or lack credibility.	
Body [Analyse & Synthesise argument/ issues logically and clearly.] 20%	Articulates the main arguments/issues clearly & interprets the results of all sources to develop a logical analysis of the argument/issue.	Studies are generally described in enough detail so that their relation to RQ & variables can be understood. Analysis is logical but some sections are unclear due to unnecessary quotations or poor paraphrases and sentence structure.	Literature may not reviewed in enough detail to provide a logical analysis. Some of the analysis seems to be inaccurate or not well- linked to the topic and are unclear due to poor sentence structure.	Too few citations are included for the reader to be confident that that literature has been adequately reviewed & there is over-reliance on direct quotations. Much of the analysis of literature is inaccurate or unclear due to poor sentence structure.	
Body [Evaluate & Reflect on strengths & limitations of the literature used.] 10%	Shows understanding of the strengths & limitations of the literature used & limitations identified are logical.	Shows some understanding of the strengths & limitations of the literature used, however 1 statement is incorrect or illogical.	Shows some understanding of the strengths & limitations of the literature used however, 2+ statements are inaccurate.	Shows vague or no understanding of strengths & limitations.	
Conclusion [Analyse & Synthesise all findings succinctly]. 10%	Conclusion succinctly describes findings of all sources cited & addresses the RQ/aim.	Conclusion generated takes into account all sources cited however does not adequately address the RQ/aim.	Conclusion generated does not take into account all sources cited or may lack clarity & does not adequately address the RQ/aim.	Summary of main findings are poorly written & show little relevance to RQ/aim.	
Conclusion [Evaluate & Reflect implications on future research.] 10%	Implications of main findings on future research are clearly & adequately identified & are logical.	Implications of main findings on future research are identified & are logical but could be clearer.	Implications of main findings on future research are not clearly & adequately identified and some (1-2) are not logical.	Most (2+) of the implications identified are inaccurate or illogical.	
Citation & Reference [Communicate & Apply ethically.] 10%	Begins on a new page with centred heading. All sources used are cited & referenced according APA conventions & included in the reference section in an alphabetical order. Has a 1inch hanging indent.	Begins on a new page with centred heading. Citation for the article did follow APA style; however; a few (2) errors are evident in the reference list or citation.	Correct heading. A few errors (3-4) in citation or reference list &1-2 literature have not been included in the reference list.	Incorrect heading. Few (4+) errors in citation & reference list. 2+ literature have not been included in the reference list	
APA Style [Communicate & Apply ethically.] 2.5%	Assignment is typed using Times New Roman (Font size 12) & has 1.5 line spacing. Page numbers are included & doesn't have page borders.	Follows APA style, however, 1 error is evident in format.	Follows APA style however, 2 errors are evident in format.	Follows APA style however, 3 errors are evident in format.	

Copyright © The University of the South Pacific, 2015. Rubric designed by course coordinator Ms Shazna Buksh. Available under Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. Adapted from Gottfried, Vosmik & Johnson (2008). *A Rubric for Evaluating a Psychology Research Report*. Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology (OTRP), http://devscilabs.com/portal/files/Rubric%20article%20draft_July%2015.pdf Reference: Willison, J. and O'Regan, K., 2006 and 2013. *The Research Skills Development Framework*.