

AP Psychology Summer Work

River Ridge High School

Mr. McHugh

Email: mmchugh@pasco.k12.fl.us

JOURNAL ARTICLE REVIEW (3 of them)

These may be submitted electronically via email or in person at the beginning of the year. Late work is accepted and penalized as per tardiness, starting at 10% off the top.

Requirements:

1.The report must be based on your reading of an ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER from a SCHOLARLY PSYCHOLOGY JOURNAL. Use **EBSCO Host** via our media center or the schools website to search for articles. **ERIC** and **TopicSearch** are two good places to start.....**Username and Password are Pasco1 and Flamingo**. Please DO NOT PAY for any articles. There is a wealth of free ones out there.

2.The article you choose must be related to Psychology. This would be the term you search for when looking online through online databases.

3.The article must have a publication date of no earlier than 2004. The more recent, the more interesting as it may relate to you!

4The article must report on empirical research. To determine whether your article reports on empirical research, look to see whether it has a METHODS or PROCEDURES section that is clearly labeled as such.

5.If there is any doubt as to whether the paper you have chosen will be acceptable, you must check it out with me.

OVERVIEW:

The final version must be at **most** 2 FULL double-spaced typed pages (I do not grade either single spaced or hand written papers).You must follow the guidelines below.

Please supply all of the information requested below concerning the paper you read. Please write your paper using the following sections and section headings.

A. Full BIBLIOGRAPHICAL reference

State the full bibliographic reference for the article you are reviewing (authors, title, journal name, volume, issue, year, page numbers, etc.) Important: this is not the bibliography listed at the end of the article, rather the citation of the article itself!

The goal of the journal article review is to familiarize you with scholarly research in psychology and how research studies are conducted and described.

In other words, begin your paper with a section entitled TITLE.

1. Whenever you refer to your study in your paper, you must reference the information from the article you read using the name and date system used by the American Psychological Association (APA) (reference this website: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>).

B.State the HYPOTHESIS of this study.

(Remember, a hypothesis makes a specific PREDICTION. A hypothesis is NOT a statement of purpose.)

C.Summarize the BACKGROUND information

What information was available to the authors that prompted them to do the study. (Tell me WHY the study was done.)

D.Describe the METHODS and subjects used.

There are 2 parts to this section.

1. Identify the research method used in the study

- a. if your study was experimental research, then identify the independent and dependent variables and the control and experimental groups
- b. naturalistic or laboratory observation
- c. case study
- d. survey
- e. psychological test

2. Describe specifically what the authors did; how he, she or they conducted this experiment in a step-by-step description. Do not include statistical methods.

E. What were the most important RESULTS of the study?

What information did they obtain? Do not confuse this with conclusions of the study. The results sections often describe the outcome in statistical terms that you may not understand, please just skip over the statistics and give a brief summary of what happened in your own words (do NOT just quote what the authors said....I want you to try to put this in your own words).

F. What was the CONCLUSION of the study?

Did it SUPPORT or REFUTE the original hypothesis? Explain the meaning and/or implications of the conclusion. Again, be sure to use your own words.

G. What is your CRITIQUE of this article?

In this section you should state your opinions of how well (or poorly) the authors did their research and presented the research results in the article. Your critique can contain both positive and negative comments.

The following are suggestions only:

- * Does it build upon the appropriate foundation (i.e., upon appropriate prior research)?
- * Did the authors choose the correct approach, and then execute it properly?
- * How confident are you in the article's results, and why?
- * Are its ideas really new, or do the authors simply repackage old ideas and perhaps give them a new name?

- * Do the authors discuss everything they promise in the article's introduction and outline?
- * What are the article's shortcomings (faults) and limitations (boundaries)? Did it discuss all of the important aspects and issues in its domain (topic area)?
- * In what way should the article have made a contribution, but then did not?
- * Do the authors make appropriate comparisons to similar events, cases or occurrences?
- * How complete and thorough a job did the authors do? Do the authors include an adequate discussion, analysis and conclusions? Did they justify everything adequately? Did they provide enough background information for the intended audience to understand it? For you to understand it?
- * Were there adequate and appropriate examples and illustrations?

For full credit, ask yourself these questions when justifying your critique points:

- * why/why not?
- * how?
- * what distinguishes the differences/different approaches, and in what ways?

Criteria

Content

Grammar, spelling 5 points

Writing style: clarity, organization, sentence and paragraph structure, language usage 10 points

Presentation: title, absence of handwritten corrections, margins, sloppiness, typed, double-spaced, stapled (when handed in), follows all instructions, reference list conforms to APA style 10 points

SECTION TOTAL **25 points**

Content

Underlined journal article submitted 5 points

Clear statement of hypothesis 5 points

Accurate identification of research method 10 points

Thorough and accurate description of methods and procedures 10 points

Effort to understand and describe results 10 points

Accurate and thorough description of conclusions 10 points

Thorough and original critique 25 points

SECTION TOTAL **75 points**