

Behavioral Sciences Rubric

	4 (Exemplary)	3 (Accomplished)	2 (Developing)	1 (Beginning)	0 (Unacceptable)
Focus	Relevant research is thoroughly and completely discussed. Contains well-developed, interesting central ideas. Key concepts are identified and operationally defined. Paper does not contain irrelevant information that detracts from focus. Clear knowledge of audience. Objective stance maintained throughout document.	Relevant research is adequately addressed. Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined. Contains some irrelevant information but does not detract from focus. Awareness of audience, situation, occasion. Objective stance mostly maintained	Paper addresses the relevant research generally satisfactorily, though explanations and elaborations may be imprecise. Most of the key concepts are identified and operationally defined, though the definitions may be imprecise. Contains some irrelevant information but does not significantly detract from focus. Some awareness of audience, situation, occasion. Objectivity mostly maintained, though occasional subjective remarks occur.	Paper does not adequately address the relevant research; explanations may be imprecise and faulty. Very few key concepts are identified and clearly defined. Paper contains too much irrelevant information that seriously detracts from focus. Little or no awareness of audience, situation, occasion. Frequent subjective intrusions.	Relevant research not discussed. Key concepts either not identified or are identified in a confusing manner. Contains irrelevant information. No awareness of audience, situation, occasion. Very frequent subjective remarks.
Organization & Development	Organization and development of content is logical. Content is well developed. Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are clearly formulated and articulated. Relevant research support is provided when necessary. Conclusion is fully and clearly articulated. Paragraphs are effectively developed with excellent elaboration of content. Smooth, sophisticated transitions	Organization and development of content is logical with minimal errors. Content and central idea is developed. Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are adequately formulated and articulated. Conclusion is adequately and clearly articulated. Paragraphs are developed with content well discussed. Mostly smooth transitions between and within paragraphs. Generally clear introduction.	Organization and development of content is adequate. Content is not well developed. Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are stated, but may lack precision and clarity. Conclusion is stated, but lacks precision and clarity. Paper has few problems with structure. Content only adequately discussed/ developed. Occasional transitions between and within paragraphs. Main thesis/ critique/hypothesis	Organization and development of content is insufficient. Content is not developed. Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are poorly stated and do not become evident until the end. Conclusion is poorly stated, and is faulty Paper has many problems with structure. Content poorly discussed/ developed. Awkward or missing transitions between and within paragraphs. Weak/ incoherent introduction;	Organization and development lacking. Content and central ideas are not developed. Hypotheses/Aims/Objectives are not stated and do not become evident until the end. Conclusion is not stated. Paper has no logic and paragraphs are random and lack explanation. Writing is ineffective; unconvincing discussion of topic. No transitions. Incoherent and inappropriate or missing

	<p>between and within paragraphs. Clear introduction, with the statement of main thesis/critique/hypothesis. Effective, thorough and coherent literature review. Apt, interesting, and insightful conclusions. Exceptional creativity, critical thinking skills, and ability to synthesize the literature</p>	<p>Main thesis/critique identified at some point. Mostly coherent and adequate literature review. Effective conclusions, though no author insight or further implications offered.</p>	<p>stated at some point, though not explicitly and clearly. Generally satisfactory review of relevant literature and occasional attempt to tie it to the main thesis/critique/hypothesis. Adequate conclusions; no author insight or further implications offered.</p>	<p>main thesis/critique/hypothesis poorly stated. Limited and rudimentary review of relevant literature. No attempt is made to tie it to the main thesis/critique/hypothesis. Weak/mechanical/incomplete conclusions.</p>	<p>literature review. No attempt is made to tie it to the main thesis/critique/hypothesis. Main thesis/critique/hypothesis not stated or stated confusingly. Missing, ineffective, dull, incoherent, or irrelevant conclusions.</p>
Style/Sentence Structure	<p>Sophisticated and varied sentence structure and length. Objective, efficient academic language. Smooth, clear, and economic style. No wordiness.</p>	<p>Frequently varied sentence structure and length with rare style or structure errors. Mostly objective, efficient academic language. Generally clear and economic style. Little wordiness.</p>	<p>Occasional variation in sentence structure and length. Generally pragmatically adequate, though some inappropriate (informal) style may appear. Occasional stylistic errors. Writing style has some wordiness.</p>	<p>No variation in sentence structure – very simple syntax, short and simple sentences. Distracting expressions and syntax are used frequently. Style frequently pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language. Sentence structure has frequent errors. Writing is wordy.</p>	<p>No variation in sentence structure – very simple and frequently erroneous syntax. Very short sentences. Style mostly pragmatically inadequate with excess informal language. Very frequent structure errors which render sentences incomprehensible. Excessive wordiness.</p>
Grammar/Mechanics	<p>No grammatical errors. No spelling and punctuation errors. Free of mechanical errors (number of page missing, running head misplaced, hanging section title, etc.)</p>	<p>Few grammatical errors. Infrequent spelling, punctuation, and mechanical errors.</p>	<p>Some grammatical errors. Some spelling, punctuation, and mechanical errors.</p>	<p>Distracting number of grammatical errors. Distracting number of spelling, usage and mechanical errors.</p>	<p>Excessive errors in grammar, spelling, or mechanical conventions. Distorted, obscure, or incomprehensible meaning.</p>
Research/Citations	<p>Flawless discipline-required (e.g., APA/ASA) format and document design. Unfailingly correct in-text</p>	<p>Mostly appropriate discipline-required (e.g., APA/ASA) section headings and subheadings. Infrequent errors in in-text</p>	<p>Some lapses in discipline-required (e.g., APA/ASA) conformity. Paper sections occasionally</p>	<p>Frequent lapses in discipline-required (e.g., APA/ASA) conformity. Paper sections frequently APA</p>	<p>Paper mostly discipline-required (e.g., APA/ASA) inconsistent. Widespread errors in in-text</p>

	<p>citations, with the name of the author and the year of publication specified. Citations are provided immediately after the reference is made to a theory, construct, or research study rather than at the end of the paragraph. Whenever appropriate, multiple citations are used.</p> <p>Flawless reference section. Complete absence of plagiarism. Paper does not overuse quotations.</p>	<p>citations.</p> <p>Occasional errors in reference section.</p> <p>Complete absence of plagiarism.</p>	<p>inconsistent with APA.</p> <p>Some errors in in-text citations and in reference section.</p> <p>Complete absence of plagiarism.</p>	<p>inconsistent.</p> <p>Frequent errors in in-text citations and in reference section.</p> <p>Complete absence of plagiarism.</p>	<p>citations and in reference section.</p> <p>Evidence of plagiarism.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	---