

Please cite as: Kulpa, A. (2018). *Understanding Concepts in Social Science Research through Werewolves*. Edmonton, Alberta: MacEwan University.

## **Werewolves Assignment Rubric (March 10 component)**

### **Structure 3 pts**

#### **Excellent (3/3)**

- the piece draws on the relevant textbook material, and at least one article on the reading list
- the use of research is clear through competent attempts at citations and referencing
- writing is technically correct and articulates ideas clearly

#### **Adequate (2/3)**

- the piece draws on the relevant textbook material, and at least one article on the reading list
- there are attempts to cite and reference sources, though some of these may be missing or incorrect
- writing is generally clear and technically correct, although there are places where ideas are not expressed clearly enough to be understood

#### **Requires Improvement (0/3-1/3)**

- the piece fails to use at least one of the required sources
- there is no attempt to cite sources appropriately, or such attempts are grossly inadequate
- there may be serious issues with writing and clarity, such that grasping the intended thought is difficult

### **Definition 5 pts**

#### **Excellent (5/5)**

- the student's definition of the concept is clear, correct, and addresses the breadth/nuance of the concept (e.g. different aspects or elements, different ways it can be expressed, the effect of contexts on people's actions in relation to this idea, etc.)
- connects both of the required sources to make an argument for a single definition (e.g. both the textbook and article are used to define the concept, rather than a definition from the textbook and an example from the reading list)
- if quotations are used, they are short and integrated into the student's explanation and discussion (e.g. you can't just quote how other people defined it)

#### **Adequate (3/5-4/5)**

- the student's definition of the concept is clear and correct, and identifies different aspects, although the relationship between these may not be clear (e.g. identifying aspects but not how they fit together, or noting but not explaining the idea of context)

- both the textbook and the article off the reading list are used, but these may not be integrated or explained (e.g. the definition is from one source, with the other one thrown in “because it needs to be there”)
- quotations may be longer, and less well integrated (e.g. quoting the textbook’s entire definition, or quoting two discussions of the same concept without discussing how these fit together)

#### Requires Improvement (0/5-2/5)

- the student’s definition is incorrect, unclear, or overly simplistic (e.g. failing to acknowledge various aspects of the concept)
- the definition uses no sources, or only a single source for reference

#### **Example                      5pts**

##### Excellent (5/5)

- the relevant aspects of the example are identified and described (e.g. everything you need is there, and there’s nothing superfluous)
- the example relies on observable elements of participants’ behaviors (e.g. things you can see), or offers a clear method for inferring individuals’ internal states (e.g. “I infer a high level of mastery in this person because of the expectant tone in their voice when they made the request, indicating that they expected to be able to get their way and control the outcome.”)
- appropriate measures are taken to ensure the anonymity of participants (e.g. pseudonyms, descriptions rather than names, etc.)
- the link between the example and definition is clearly explained (you’ve discussed at how these observations are an example of this concept)

##### Adequate (3/5-4/5)

- most of the relevant aspects of the example are identified and described, although some minor aspects may be missing and/or there may be some superfluous elements
- the example mostly relies on observable elements of participants’ behaviors, but there may be more reliance on internal states with incomplete articulations of how the link from internal states to behaviors is established
- appropriate measures are taken to ensure the anonymity of participants (e.g. pseudonyms, descriptions rather than names, etc.)
- the link between example and definition is discussed, although it may not be clearly explained

##### Requires Improvement (0/5-2/5)

- relevant aspects of the example are missing from the description, and/or there are many elements which are superfluous to what is necessary
- the example may rely on statements about presumed internal states, rather than observations of behavior, and/or the link between the observations and behavior may be poorly explained and articulated
- appropriate measures to ensure the anonymity of participants are not taken (e.g. you’re describing people by their real names)
- a link between the example and definition is missing, or so unclear as to be unhelpful

## **Application 7 pts**

### Excellent (6/7-7/7)

- there is a clear discussion of how these observations relate to learning about the concept (e.g. how concept applies in different contexts, questions about what might be missing/need further research, variations between individuals based on status, etc.)
- there is a statement of why the insights related to these observations are helpful in understanding this concept (e.g. why is it important that this concept does or does not apply in this context?)
- in cases where the concept, as defined, does not apply well, there is an attempt to explain why that might be (e.g. is the issue with the concept or the context? At what level is there an issue with the context (e.g. age of participants, gender balance, the goal of the group getting together, etc.))

### Adequate (4/7-5/7)

- there is a discussion of how observations relate to the concept, but this may be very brief or unclear
- there is an attempt to explain how the insights related to these observations are helpful, but this may not be clear, or fully explained
- if the concept does not apply well in this context, attempts to explain this difference may be superficial or not well-grounded in social psychology

### Requires Improvement (0/7-3/7)

- observations are not discussed in relation to learning about the concept chosen, or are discussed very superficially/in relation to the game itself rather than social psychology in general
- there is little attempt to explain how insights related to these observations are helpful, or that argument is not based in social psychology
- if the concept does not apply well in this context, the writer either seems unaware of this, or does not attempt to explain why this might be

## **Werewolves Assignment Rubric (April 3 component)**

### **Structure**

**5 pts**

#### **Excellent (5/5)**

- the piece draws on the relevant textbook material, at least one article on the reading list, and at least one peer-reviewed article the student has located themselves
- the use of research is clear through competent attempts at citations and referencing
- writing is technically correct and articulates ideas clearly

#### **Adequate (3/5-4/5)**

- the piece draws on the relevant textbook material, at least one article on the reading list, and at least one peer-reviewed article the student has located themselves
- there are attempts to cite and reference sources, though some of these may be missing or incorrect
- writing is generally clear and technically correct, although there are places where ideas are not expressed clearly enough to be understood

#### **Requires Improvement (0/5-2/5)**

- the piece fails to use at least one of the required sources
- there is no attempt to cite sources appropriately, or such attempts are grossly inadequate
- there may be serious issues with writing and clarity, such that grasping the intended thought is difficult

### **Definition**

**5 pts**

#### **Excellent (5/5)**

- the student's definition of the concept is clear, correct, and addresses the breadth/nuance of the concept (e.g. different aspects or elements, different ways it can be expressed, the effect of contexts on people's actions in relation to this idea, etc.)
- connects both of the required sources to make an argument for a single definition (e.g. both the textbook and article are used to define the concept, rather than a definition from the textbook and an example from the reading list)
- if quotations are used, they are short and integrated into the student's explanation and discussion (e.g. you can't just quote how other people defined it)

#### **Adequate (3/5-4/5)**

- the student's definition of the concept is clear and correct, and identifies different aspects, although the relationship between these may not be clear (e.g. identifying aspects but not how they fit together, or noting but not explaining the idea of context)
- both the textbook and the article off the reading list are used, but these may not be integrated or explained (e.g. the definition is from one source, with the other one thrown in "because it needs to be there")
- quotations may be longer, and less well integrated (e.g. quoting the textbook's entire definition, or quoting two discussions of the same concept without discussing how these fit together)

#### **Requires Improvement (0/5-2/5)**

- the student's definition is incorrect, unclear, or overly simplistic (e.g. failing to acknowledge various aspects of the concept)
- the definition uses no sources, or only a single source for reference

## **Examples 10pts**

### Excellent (8/10-10/10)

- there are three distinct examples of the concept in question discussed
- the relevant aspects of the examples are identified and described (e.g. everything you need is there, and there's nothing superfluous), and the distinctions between the three examples are clear
- the example relies on observable elements of participants' behaviors (e.g. things you can see), or offers a clear method for inferring individuals' internal states (e.g. "I infer a high level of mastery in this person because of the expectant tone in their voice when they made the request, indicating that they expected to be able to get their way and control the outcome.")
- appropriate measures are taken to ensure the anonymity of participants (e.g. pseudonyms, descriptions rather than names, etc.)
- the link between the example and definition is clearly explained (you've discussed at how these observations are an example of this concept)

### Adequate (5/10-7/10)

- there are three distinct examples of the concept in question discussed
- most of the relevant aspects of the example are identified and described, although some minor aspects may be missing and/or there may be some superfluous elements, there are distinctions drawn between various examples, although these may not always be clear
- the example mostly relies on observable elements of participants' behaviors, but there may be more reliance on internal states with incomplete articulations of how the link from internal states to behaviors is established
- appropriate measures are taken to ensure the anonymity of participants (e.g. pseudonyms, descriptions rather than names, etc.)
- the link between example and definition is discussed, although it may not be clearly explained

### Requires Improvement (0/10-4/10)

- fewer than three examples of this concept are discussed
- relevant aspects of the example are missing from the description, and/or there are many elements which are superfluous to what is necessary; distinctions between the examples may not be clear
- the example may rely on statements about presumed internal states, rather than observations of behavior, and/or the link between the observations and behavior may be poorly explained and articulated
- appropriate measures to ensure the anonymity of participants are not taken (e.g. you're describing people by their real names)
- a link between the example and definition is missing, or so unclear as to be unhelpful

**Application 15 pts**

Excellent (13/15-15/15)

- there is a clear discussion of how these observations relate to learning about the concept (e.g. how concept applies in different contexts, questions about what might be missing/need further research, variations between individuals based on status, etc.)
- there is a statement of why the insights related to these observations are helpful in understanding this concept (e.g. why is it important that this concept does or does not apply in this context?)
- in cases where the concept, as defined, does not apply well, there is an attempt to explain why that might be (e.g. is the issue with the concept or the context? At what level is there an issue with the context (e.g. age of participants, gender balance, the goal of the group getting together, etc.))

Adequate (8/15-12/15)

- there is a discussion of how observations relate to the concept, but this may be very brief or unclear
- there is an attempt to explain how the insights related to these observations are helpful, but this may not be clear, or fully explained
- if the concept does not apply well in this context, attempts to explain this difference may be superficial or not well-grounded in social psychology

Requires Improvement (0/15-7/15)

- observations are not discussed in relation to learning about the concept chosen, or are discussed very superficially/in relation to the game itself rather than social psychology in general
- there is little attempt to explain how insights related to these observations are helpful, or that argument is not based in social psychology
- if the concept does not apply well in this context, the writer either seems unaware of this, or does not attempt to explain why this might be