

TO: Students in 605

FROM: RBT

DATE: 4/26/06

RE: End of semester stuff:

Getting ready for Second in-Class exam;  
Final paper guidelines and grading rubric

Now that the poster session is almost out of the way, let's try and bring in to focus what is happening for the rest of the semester with this never ending course.

### STRUCTURE OF THE SECOND IN CLASS EXAM

The second in class exam takes place next Thursday, 3:00 – 5:30, in the usual location. The purpose of this second exam is to do a criterion assessment in two areas: your ability to decode and correctly interpret HLM output and/or descriptions of an HLM analysis, and your ability to decode HLM tables from publications in criminal justice or sociology or psychology.

More specifically, here is what the exam will look like

- A. (50%) You will see two different HLM tables from two different publications, at least one of which will be on the CD ROM distributed at the beginning of the semester. I will provide you with the data/study background, and ask you to interpret key features of this table, and what specific advantages the study achieved by using HLMs. One of these tables is likely to be from a “full” IASAO model. One of these tables could have a binary outcome variable. It is not known at this time if I am going to ask you multiple choice questions about these tables, or to write about them.
- B. (40%) You will see some sections of HLM output, or maybe an entire HLM output file. If it is not from the current PAS data set, the data source and the structure of aggregation will be explained. You will be asked to respond to key questions based on this output. The questions may be true/false, or multiple choice, or I may ask you to write; not known yet.
- C. (10%) The idea is: if there is a certain type of research question, which type of HLM model do I want to run? You should know what the ANOVA, ANCOVA, RCR, MAOR, and IASAO models each do. Although this is not something we have talked explicitly about, it is something which should have percolated with you all to some extent. Because we have not talked about it as much in class as I would have liked, I am just putting in a tiny bit of this stuff.

Some thoughts on getting ready. (1) Practice with a few of the tables from studies on the disk. (2) Take a look at Raudenbush and Bryk and review the section where they introduce each submodel. (3) Review the full model example we have gone over in class and be sure you are clear on key points. (4) You want to be sure you understand the following key terms from HLM models:

Tau-00

Tau-11 (or Tau-22, Tau-33.....)

Sigma squared

Interpretation of chi squared test of Tau-00

U0j – in an ANOVA model and in a model with predictors

U1j – when it (the slope) has no predictors and when it (the slope) is being predicted

B0j

B1j (or B2j)

G00

G10 (when slope is fixed and when a slope is allowed to vary; when a slope has no predictors and when it has predictors)

Reliability

Intraclass correlation

Interpreting an odds ratio for a predictor from a two level model with a binary outcome

(You do **NOT** need to worry about deviance, or R squared at Level 1 or Level 2, or about the 3 level model, or about the cross classified model, or comparisons across models)

Depending upon levels of expressed interest, it may be possible to arrange a practice/review session. Lemme know.

#### THE FINAL PAPER

It is due 5/10. **Please submit it electronically to me no later than noon on that date. I have to have final grades done by 10 am Friday the 12<sup>th</sup>. THIS IS A REAL DEADLINE, NOT A STRONG SUGGESTION. FOLKS HAVE MADE IT HARDER AND HARDER TO GET GRADES CHANGED, SO PLEASE BE ON TIME WITH THIS.**

I have provided a detailed grading rubric which appears on the next page. I have tried to make it pretty comprehensive, so you should be able to use it as a checklist if you want.

I also have updated “Ralph’s Rules for Papers” ( on the web site at <http://www.rbtaylor.net/ralphsrules4papers.htm> including a couple of sections specific to this course)and you might want to take another look at that.

**NOTE: I know you do not have the time to prepare submission-ready manuscripts.** That is a given. The **main implication** of the lack of time, as I see it, is that you do not have time to prep a really extensive and incredibly well organized introductory section. In other words I do not expect that this section will be submission ready. But every other section could/should be pretty close. **Do what you can in the time you have, and pay attention to these guidelines AND to the specific feedback I have given you previously.**

CJ 605 SPRING 2006 GRADING RUBRIC FOR FINAL PAPERS					
			Possible scores, and percent credit earned		
	Max pct.	Fail (0)	Low pass (1/3)	Pass (2/3)	High pass (all)
Title page	5	Not included	Missing two or more of the requested items	Missing some requested information	has all the requested information: title, author, contact information, data source, acknowledgments
Abstract	10	not included	Is missing at least two of the desired elements stated at far right, and/or is very confusingly written	Has all or most of the information noted at right; or has all of the information at right but is not clear and/or not clearly linked to results	clear statement of key questions, theoretical relevance, data sources, key findings, and clear statement of implications for theory; further, implications link clearly and correctly to results observed
Introduction	20	Lacks a clear statement of key outstanding questions from previous research AND a clear statement of the proposed theoretical model (or, in the case of grounded theorizing, the key issues which will be explored) AND MANY key studies left out	If the material noted at right is mostly ANDs rather than ORs	Literature is cited but the connections between topics is not clear and/or key references are left out and/or connections not made to the present study and/or the model is not clearly stated	Well organized; intelligent use of subheadings and/or explanatory/organizing figures; good connections between topics; clear orienting front section; clear closing/summary section; clear statement of model included; clear statement of (why) this research is needed / key questions remaining despite prior research); correct use of in-line cites and quotations where appropriate; when describing past work good balance between detail and connections to the big picture. Very IMPORTANTLY is RELATIVELY in-depth in terms of scope of works reviewed
Methods	15	Is NOT clear AND is missing SEVERAL key items needed.	Is NOT clear in several places OR is missing several of the key items needed noted at far right	Is clear but is missing one or two of the items noted at right, and/or is incomplete for one or two of the items at right	Includes ALL of the following: clear description of data sources; clear description of key data properties (e.g., response rate for surveys); clear description of all variables and their response formats including the outcome; clear thumbnail description of sample; clear description of how indices were constructed (if appropriate); clear description of analytic strategy; descriptive Table 1
Results	15	Confusing, hard to follow, incorrect in many places (wrong numbers cross referenced in table and/or direction interpreted improperly and/or significance and non-significance confused and/or wrong table referenced)	Results are mostly correct, but not presented in a comprehensive fashion, and/or not presented in an integrative fashion, and/or hard to follow in just a couple of places	Results are correct, with correct interpretations and cross references to tables but are presented in a serial rather than organic fashion, and lack key summary statements	Clear, correct and comprehensive; results presented in logical order with connections between different results; easy-to-follow cross references to tables; results explained in non-technical terms; summary of key points
Discussion	20	Does very little of the stuff on the far right and/or is extremely confusing/illogical/hard to follow and/or is just way too brief	Does even less of the stuff on the far right and/or does it in a way that is not completely sensible/understandable given the current results, and/or is hard to follow, and/or fails to explore these issues in sufficient depth and thoughtfulness	Does most of the stuff on the right, and/or does all of the stuff on the right but in a disjointed or not completely logical fashion; and/or is somewhat too truncated	Summarizes major findings (if this was not done at end of results (pulls back to see the forest for the trees)); looks back to reconsider the theories introduced earlier in light of the current results, and updates the views of those theories in a way that makes sense given the current results; looks ahead in terms of where the work and/or theories need elaboration based specifically on what was found or not found in the current study, described in specific terms, not just the usual clarification call for further research; clear statement of strengths and weakness of current study; section is clearly organized with subheadings and logical flow between sections
References	5	Several missing references; and/or several missing in line citations; and/or serious formatting problems	Closer to the left	Closer to the right	All references included and properly formatted; all in-line citations are where they need to be; all quotations are properly in-line cited with page numbers
Tables Figures (if included the 5% for tables is spread over both tables and figures)	5	Tables/maps/figures referred to in the text are missing AND/OR tables/maps/figures are impossible to figure out AND/OR specific results mentioned in the text do NOT MATCH with what you are showing in the tables/maps/figures. Such a lack of correspondence is serious.	Text and tables/figures correspond, but at least one table or one figure or one map is lacking key information such that it cannot be interpreted	Text corresponds throughout to the tables/figures/maps but at least one or two key points are missing; EACH of the tables/figures/maps is mostly interpretable	Clear, well organized, good titles, clear explanatory notes; easy for the reader to walk through; everything is labeled; numbers or figures match text
Criminology or APA or ASA formatting followed throughout	5	Hardly at all	Some of the time	Most of the time	All the time
Total	100	NOTE: you can lose points for mis-spelled words and/or flagrant grammatical errors - you may lose 1 to 2 points per error. If the error is something I have harped on -- "data are" -- it may cost you even more.			