| Article summaries #1 and #2 |
| --- |

As part of the preparation for your final project, you will submit an **article summary** for **each** of the two articles you have chosen to combine or contrast.  The content of each article summary will be very similar to that of the group presentation you have already done, but in the form of a short paper rather than slides.  Note that the article summaries focus closely on the **research question(s) and results** from the original articles, even if the way you will use information from the articles for your final presentation is different.

*Format of article summary:*

- If you choose an article that presents multiple experiments, you can decide whether to focus on just one, more than one, or all of the experiments in your article report.  This decision may depend on what is relevant for your project.

- Your report should be about 4 to 6 pages long (double-spaced).  Longer is fine if necessary, but do not pad your writing just to add length.

- Include the bibliographic citation for your source at the end (but this does not have to be on a separate page).

- Your report  should be **in your own words**, except for short quotations if necessary (indicate these with quotation marks or block-quote indentations, and give page-number citations).  Don't just put together four pages of excerpts from the article— convince me that *you understood it yourself*.  However, you may include screenshots of data graphics or data tables from the article in your report (again, these should have page-number citations).

- Use your **best writing style**.  This doesn't mean being fancy:  aim for **simple and clear prose**.  Divide your writing into **paragraphs** and make sure each paragraph makes a **point** or contributes to the discussion.  Reread your own writing to catch typos but also to check that the **logic** of your discussion is clear to the reader.

*Content of article summary:*

(1)     What is/are some key **big-picture research question**(s) addressed by the article?

(2)     For each **experiment** that you discuss:
- What specific **measurable research questions** were addressed?  How do the measurable research questions relate to the big-picture research question?  Make sure you give the measurable research questions in a **quantitative** (numerical) form:  "Is A larger than B?"  "Does Y increase as X increases?"
- What was the **methodology**? (Participants?  Materials?  Task?)  Give one **example stimulus** from **each condition** of the experiment, and **explain** how the stimulus design relates to the measurable research questions.
- What were the **results**?

(3)     Your summary should include at least one **data graphic**.  (Remember, this does *not* mean the same thing as a data *table*!)  If the article includes a data graphic, you may

use that.  If the article has no data graphic, or if you would prefer to make one, you may use numerical data from the article to create your own data graphic.

Make sure that the data graphic you choose, or create, addresses the **results** of one of the **measurable research questions** of the experiment (not background information about participants, or properties of the stimuli, etc.)

- **Show** the data graphic (you can take a screenshot from your source; just be sure to give a page-number citation for the graphic)
- **Parse** the data graphic:  Explain what is represented on each axis and, where relevant, what the different colors, bars, plotting symbols, etc., mean.  It can be helpful to keep the research questions in mind as you think about how to do this.
- **Interpret** the data graphic:  Explain how the graphic *illustrates* the result under discussion—tell the reader *what to look at* in order to *see the point*.

(4)  State whether and how the results **answer** the measurable research question and the big-picture research question.

(5)  Identify **problems** or **concerns** with the experiments or their interpretation, if any.  This may include concerns raised by the authors (if so, make that clear and give a citation) and/or concerns that you raise yourself.

(6)  At the end, include a **brief discussion** of how you are planning to use the information that you have just summarized as part of your final project.

***Changing your article:***  At some point during the project process, you may decide that you would like to change one (or both) of your articles and replace it with a different one.  This might happen when you get your topic proposal feedback, or while you are working on one or both of your article summaries, or when you get your article summary feedback.  **It is always permitted** to change your article if you find that you need to.  You are welcome to check in with me about your new article, but this is not required.

## Grading criteria — Article summary

|  | **Excellent (A)** | **Competent (B~C)** | **Needs work (D~F)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Overall content* | • Article content accurate<br>• Big-picture RQs - insightful<br>• Measurable RQs/each expt - quantitative and specific<br>• Stimuli exx linked to meas. RQs<br>• Study results linked back to RQs<br>• Article was well understood<br>• Link to your project made clear<br>• Class concepts/terms used where appropriate | • Content {mostly\|partly} accurate<br>• BPRQs identified somewhat<br>• Meas RQs not quantitative<br>• Meas RQs not specific<br>• Exx not {shown \| linked to RQs}<br>• Results somewhat linked to RQs<br>• Not clear if fully understood<br>• Link to your project mentioned<br>• Some opportunities to use class concepts missed | • Content inaccurate<br>• BPRQs not addressed<br>• MRQs insuffic.<br><br>• No stimuli discussed<br>• No return to RQs<br>• Misinterpreted<br>• No link to project<br>• Many opportunities/ class concepts missed |
| *Experiments, results, and data graphics* | • Methodology explained<br>• At least one data graphic shown<br><br>• DG clearly parsed<br>• DG insightfully interpreted<br>• Results insightfully explained | • Methodology partly explained<br>• Only a data *table* shown<br>• DG not focused on measurable RQ<br>• DG {mostly\|partly} parsed<br>• DG {mostly\|partly} interpreted<br>• Results disc. not fully insightful | • No methodology<br>• No data visual<br><br>• DG not parsed<br>• DG not interpreted<br>• No results discussed |
| *Criticisms of the studies* | • If relevant, criticisms of study clearly raised and supported | • Criticisms unclear or insufficiently supported | • Major problems with criticisms |
| *Mechanics* | • Article meets criteria<br>• At least 4-6 pgs double-spaced<br>• Clear writing with paragraphs<br>• Mostly in your own words<br>• Appropriate citations in text<br><br>• Bibliography format correct | • Somewhat meets criteria<br>• At least 4 pgs, but padded<br>• Writing somewhat hard to follow<br>• Heavy use of direct quotns, but citations given<br>• Data (etc.) directly quoted without page-number citation<br>• In-text citation format not as spec.<br>• Bibliography format not as spec.<br>• Many typos or errors | • Bad fit for criteria<br>• <4 pgs<br>• Very hard to follow<br>• Direct quotns used without citations<br><br>• Bib. incomplete |