

## Harold Young Research Award Rubric

Paper title:					
Category	Dimension	Exceeds Expectations 3	Average 2	Below Average 1	Score
Quality of Conceptualization of Social Research					
	<b>Problem Definition</b>	Message is clear, vivid and important. Specific, documented evidence and definitive examples draw reader in. Clear thesis.	Connections between evidence and main Ideas are clearly explained. Thesis makes paper worth reading. Some repetition may be apparent.	Message is vague. Overgeneralizations without specific examples / evidence. Lacking a clear thesis.	
	<b>Literature Review</b>	Excellent use of appropriate academic literature. The number (a minimum of 15 to 20) and quality (websites should be used sparingly, if at all) of sources cited demonstrate a sound understanding of the topic explored.	Good use of academic literature showing an ability to link the literature to broader questions and design.	Does not display an understanding of the literature and currents in the field. Makes no connections between the literature and the questions being explored. Heavy use of the inappropriate sources.	
	<b>Conceptual framework</b>	Explicitly laid out connections between the literature, the research questions, and the research design	Clearly described linkages between literature, research questions, and research design	Limited linkages between literature and research questions, and research design	
Research Design					
	<b>Sample</b>	The sample is both appropriate and adequate for the research questions.	The sample is appropriate, but not adequate.	The sample was inappropriate and inadequate for the methods chosen.	
	<b>Methods</b>	Sophisticated research design demonstrating an exceptional grasp of social research	Appropriate method for the questions being explored	Inappropriate design and method for the questions being explored	
	<b>Findings</b>	Clear description of what the student found with good tables or supporting documentation	Clear descriptions of the findings, lacking supporting documentation	Unclear and or inappropriate description of the research findings	
Discussion					
	<b>Conclusions</b>	Clearly outlines the conclusions that can be drawn from the study and addresses possible alternatives	Outlines the conclusions, with little attention to alternative conclusions	The conclusions are explained or do not match the findings	
	<b>Relevance to the Church of the Nazarene (CON) and/or the ANSR</b>	Explicit linkages from the findings are made regarding their relevance to the CON and/or the	The research addresses the sociology of religion, but relates to neither the CON	Social research with no clear connection to the sociology of religion	

	<i>meeting theme</i>	ANSR meeting theme	nor the ANSR meeting theme		
	<i>Strengths and Weaknesses</i>	Honestly addresses the strengths and limitations of the study	Briefly discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the study	Limited or no attention paid to the strengths and weaknesses of the study	
Originality					
	<i>Implications for Theory</i>	Lucidly discusses how the findings will or can influence theory development	Addresses the importance of the findings for theory	Limited or no discussion about the unique contributions of the study for theory	
Significance					
	<i>Implications for Practice</i>	Provides clear examples of the how the research relevance for the field of study	Suggests ways the research can be applied to its field	Has limited application to field of study	
Quality of Writing					
	<i>Organization</i>	Main ideas stand out. Message is clear, vivid, and important. Specific, documented evidence and definitive examples draw reader in. Paragraphs unified by a clear topic sentence and conclusion. Fluent expression. Transitions create cohesion. Ideas are clear and paper is easy to follow.	Connections between evidence and main ideas are clearly explained. Thesis makes paper worth reading. Topic sentences are supported by subordinate ideas. Paragraphs build.	Weak organization, development, and transitions. Ideas confused or disconnected. Message is vague. Overgeneralizations without specific examples or evidence.	
	<i>Mechanics</i>	Wide range of structures. Mastery of grammatical conventions. Few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, agreement, tense/mood, number, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions, and negations.	Limited variety of structures. Many simple sentences. Errors exist in grammar, but meaning is clear.	No mastery of conventions. Paper is dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing. Limited range of control over grammatical structures. Errors in agreement, tense, etc. Meaning is lost in errors.	

Include a narrative summary statement of your evaluation. Be clear, fair, and encouraging where possible. You may wish to comment on . . .

- Your overall reaction to the paper
- An aspect of the evaluation criteria where you wish to clarify your rubric score
- Aspects that stood out
- Pointers on what would have made the paper stronger
- What you see as the student's next step as a researcher

---



---

