



United States International University  
**MIS 6220 RESEARCH METHODS**

**Final Semester Examination**

**Summer 2016**

**DATE : Friday, 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 TIME :6.00 –9.00 pm**

**STUDENT ID:**

**NAME:**

Written examination (constitutes 20% the total course score))

Start: 6.00 pm

End.9.00 pm

READING TIME:

: 5 minutes

WORKING TIME:

:3 hours

TOTAL TIME:

:3 hours 5 minutes

ATTEMPT

: ALL QUESTIONS FROM THE TWO CASE STUDIES

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

2: This is an open book examination.

**SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:**

This examination paper consists of THREE (3) parts

<b><u>SECTION A-</u></b>	<b><u>MAX. SCORE WEIGHT</u></b>	<b><u>YOUR SCORE</u></b>
Submit your spiral bound topic research proposal with chapter 1, 2, and 3 and reference list	<b>50%</b>	
<b><u>SECTION B</u></b>		
Submit the case study question answers	<b>30%</b>	
<b><u>SECTION C</u></b>		
Present your proposal 8 to10 minutes	20%	
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>100%</u></b>	

## MID SEM PAT C

### MID SEMESTER MIS PROPOSAL PRESENTATION

#### Presentation Time

#	ID	Student Name	Start	End	
1	633444	Amwayi, Abel Imbosa	5.40	5.50	p.m
2	645239	Bogonko, Bina	5.50	6.00	p.m
3	645381	Buliva, Arthur	6.00	6.10	p.m
4	645406	Gachemi, Hildah Wakarima	6.10	6.20	p.m
5	645619	Gituku, Victor Wainaina	6.20	6.30	p.m
6	623910	Jackohango, Reggies Oluoch	6.30	6.40	p.m
7	642252	Kinuthia, Mary Njeri	6.40	6.50	p.m
8	645509	Kojwang, Dennis Odhiambo	6.50	7.00	p.m
9	631448	Kweingoti, Shadrack Benard	7.00	7.10	p.m
10	630955	Masinde, John Kizito	7.10	7.20	p.m
11	645257	Mbaabu, Ken Kiriinya	7.20	7.30	p.m
12	627986	Ng'ang'a, Allan Kevin	7.30	7.40	p.m
13	645261	Ochwada, Hannington Hosea	7.40	7.50	p.m
14	645392	Rogito, Pauline Kemunto	7.50	8.00	p.m
15	645302	Ruciini, Emily Wanjiru	8.00	8.10	p.m
16	642481	Tallam, Mercy Jebichii	8.10	8.20	p.m
17	635698	Thumbi, Charles Ikibi	8.20	8.30	p.m
18	631182	Wachira, Janet Njeri	8.30	8.40	p.m
19	645510	Wairire, Gina Hito	8.40	8.50	p.m
20	645309	Wamaitha, Brian Kariuki	8.50	9.00	p.m

- Slide 1: Topic, your name and ID
- Slide 2: Introduction to the problem
- Slide 3: Problem statement
- Slide 4: Research objectives
- Slide 5: Literature review for Objective 1
- Slide 6: Literature review for Objective 2
- Slide 7: Literature review for Objective 3
- Slide 8: Conceptual Framework
- Slide 9: Methodology
- Slide 10: KEY references



# United States International University

## School of Science and Technology

### MID SEM MIS PROPOSAL DOCUMENT

Student Name & ID				
Project Title				
Supervisor Name	Prof Jimmy Macharia			
Task under review	Task Score Weight	Task Score		Comment
1. Title & Abstract	3			
2. Chapter 1	20			
3. Chapter 2	25			
4. Chapter 3	20			
5. Chapter 4	20			Optional Now
6. References	7			
7. Data Instruments	5			
Total Score	100%			

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
1.0 Research Topic	(1 marks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Clarity</b> is the most important quality of any research topic.</li> <li>2. <b>Well-defined</b> and well-phrased research topic is a half guarantee of a successful research.</li> <li>3. <b>The language</b> of the research topic should have to be simple.</li> <li>4. <b>The titling</b> of the research problem should follow the rules of titling.</li> <li>5. <b>Current importance</b> should also be the consideration of the researcher while selecting a research topic</li> </ol>		

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>1.0 Abstract (2 Marks)</b>				
0.1 Summary of research problem/purpose	(0.5 mks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the reason(s) for undertaking the study or the aims of the research?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		
0.2 Summary of methodology to be used	(0.5mks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Design/methodology/approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are the objectives going to be achieved? Include the main method(s) used for the research. What is the approach to the topic and what is the theoretical or subject scope of the paper?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		
0.3 Summary of expected major findings	(0.5mks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Expected Contribution of the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected Insights to a knowledge domain (This will refer to expected insights.)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected research limitations/implications (if applicable)</li> <li>Expected practical implications (if applicable)</li> <li>Expected social implications (if applicable)</li> </ul>		
0.4 Originality	(0.5mks)	4. Originality/value What will be new in the study? State the value of the study and to whom.		

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
CHAPTER ONE (20 marks)				
1.0 INTRODUCTION	(1mks)	1. The student has Introduced the topic/theme adequately		
1.1 Background of the Problem	(5 mks)	2. The student has Highlight some of the research that has been done in the area of study (this should not be limited only to the country of study) 3. The student has Identified the gaps in previous research—areas that have not yet been addressed. 4. The student has Pointed out where your work is taking off from..., why your study is still important and what new knowledge it will add to the existing knowledge (see point 2). 5. In the last paragraph the student has stated out: the main question or purpose of your paper and outline the structure of the paper.		
1.2 Statement of the Problem	(5mks)			

1.3 Objectives of the Study	(1 mks)	Are they clearly stated?		
1.3.1 General Objective	(1mks)	In view of the assumptions made the research study shall well stated		
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	(3 mks)	Are they well stated and distinct?  1.4.1. ....  1.4.2. ....  1.4.3. ....		
1.4 Justification of the Study	(1mks)	Justification supported by literature		
1.5 Scope of the Study	(1mks)	Feasible and realistic		
1.6 Definition of Terms	(1mks)	supported by literature		
Chapter Summary	(1mks)	reflective		

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW (25 Marks)</b>				
2.1 Introduction ( <i>including theoretical foundation where appropriate</i> )	(1 mks)	This chapter examines the Relevance of reviewed literature to the study, Adequacy and consistency of the reviewed literature. Correct citations of the review literature, “Up-to-datedness” (5 years?) of the reviewed literature, Usefulness of the		

		reviewed literature, say in the identification of the research problem, Quality of presentation of the literature review, for each objective, and the Quality of the chapter - no errors e.g. typographical		
2.2 Literature Review of Research objective Question 1	(7 mks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has Explained the concepts and issues relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Has Discussed the main relevant arguments concerning the issues relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</li> <li>b) Draws on existing and current research on the issues on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</li> <li>c) Discussed their findings and how they help us better understand the issues on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Reviewed research in Developed, developing countries &amp; Africa, then Kenya to highlight what has been done on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</li> <li>3. Understood how previous research was conducted: which frameworks and methods were used relating to objective one</li> </ol>		

		<p>variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>4. The student is Clear on WHAT, WHY, HOW of the issue and WHERE you are going...Which gaps your study will need to cover relating to objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p>		
<p>2.3 Literature Review of Research objective /Question 2</p>	(7 mks)	<p>1. Has Explained the concepts and issues relating to objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature:</p> <p>a) Has Discussed the main relevant arguments concerning the issues relating to objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>b) Has Drawn on existing and current research on the issues on objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>c) Has Discussed their findings and how they help us better understand the issues on objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>2. Reviewed research in Developed, developing countries &amp; Africa, then Kenya to highlight what has been done on objective one variable(s),their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>3. Understands how previous research was conducted: which frameworks and methods</p>		



		<p>were used relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>4. The student is Clear on WHAT, WHY, HOW of the issue and WHERE you are going...Which gaps your study will need to cover relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p>		
<p>2.4 Literature Review of Research objective /Question 3</p>	(7 mks)	<p>1. Has Explained the concepts and issues relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature:</p> <p>a) Has Discussed the main relevant arguments concerning the issues relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>b) Has Drawn on existing and current research on the issues on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>c) Has Discussed their findings and how they help us better understand the issues on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p> <p>2. Reviewed research in Developed, developing countries &amp; Africa, then Kenya to highlight what has been done on objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature</p>		

		3. Understands how previous research was conducted: which frameworks and methods were used relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature 4. The student is Clear on WHAT, WHY, HOW of the issue and WHERE you are going...Which gaps your study will need to cover relating to objective one variable(s), their relationships, and their measurements from existing literature		
2.5 Conceptual Framework	(3mks)	Research Framework (if applicable)  1. Is the conceptual framework and its variables supported, by current literature? 2. Is the conceptual framework showing all the variables implied by the research objectives? 3. Are the proposed variables' relationships supported by literature adequately?		
2.6 Chapter Summary				

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>5.0 Methodology (Chapter 3) [7 pgs] (20 marks)</b>				

3.1 Introduction (simply key headings below) [¼ pg]	(2mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter Intro clear</li> </ul>		
3.2 Research Design [½ – 1pg] (define, cite, show how)	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specification of the research Design, say, case study, survey or experimental design</li> </ul>		
3.3 Population and Sampling Design [1-2 pgs]				
3.3.1 Population (specify pop, show pop size)	(1 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification and description of the population</li> </ul>		
3.3.2 Sampling Design	(1 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification and description of the sampling frame, sampling method and sample size</li> </ul>		
3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame (define, cite, show how)	(1 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of the chapter - no errors e.g. typographical and support from literature</li> </ul>		
3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique (define, cite, show how)	(1 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of the sampling technique and support from literature</li> </ul>		
3.3.2.3 Sample Size (specify, show distribution table)	(1 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample size formula clarity</li> </ul>		
3.4 Data Collection Methods [½ -1pg] (instruments)	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate description of data collection methods and procedures and support from literature</li> </ul>		
3.5 Research Procedures (fieldwork - be descriptive) [½ - 1pg]	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of the research procedures and support from literature</li> </ul>		
3.6 Data Analysis Methods (SPSS is like a calculator) [½ -1 pg] (to do what? [sums? means? variances?, correlations? etc?])	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation/description of Data Analysis Methods and support from literature</li> </ul>		
3.7 Chapter Summary [¼ - ½ pg]	(1 mks)			

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>4.0 IMPLIMENTATION &amp; DESIGN (20 Marks)</b>				
4.1 Introduction (simply key headings) [¼pg]				
4.2 Analysis [1-2 pgs]	(2 mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis Design strategy</li> </ul>		
4.3 Modeling & Design (put any code over a page in the appendix)	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of Models and Designs</li> </ul>		
4.3.1 Subheading - RQ 1/Statement [4-6 pgs]	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of Models and Designs of research objective one implementation</li> </ul>		
4.3.1.1 etc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		
4.3.2 Subheading - RQ 2/Statement[4-6 pgs]	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of Models and Designs of research objective two implementation</li> </ul>		
4.3.2.1 etc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		
4.3.3 Subheading - RQ 3/Statement[4-6 pgs]	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of Models and Designs of research objective three implementation</li> </ul>		
4.3.3.1 etc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		
4.4 Proof-of-Concept [1-2 pgs] 4.5 Testing [1-2 pgs]	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of proof of concept</li> </ul>		
4.6 Show the implementation and testing	(3mks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly shows how the testing criteria</li> </ul>		

criteria used on the system [1-2 pgs]				
4.7 Chapter Summary [¼-½ pg]				

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>9 References (7 marks)</b>				
	(2 marks)	9.1 Appropriate style e.g. APA		
	(1marks)	9.2 Correct alphabetical order		
	(2 marks)	9.3 Adequacy		
	(1 marks)	9.4 Up-to-date or current		
	(1 marks)	9.5 Quality - no errors e.g typographical errors		

Research Project Proposal Components	Maximum score	Rubric/Criteria checked	Feedback Comment	Score
<b>Data Instruments (5 marks)</b>				
	(1 mark)	Appropriateness and completeness of data instrument for collecting/recording general data		
	(1 mrks)	Appropriateness and completeness of data instrument for collecting/recording/Measuring objective 1 variables data		



## MIS 6220 SU 2016 MID SEM PART B-CASE STUDY

Submission Date : Friday 1st, July 2016 -Typed Printed Document

### CASE 'CAP AIRLINES'

Daniel Lourenço is a Portuguese International Business student. Born in Reguengos de Monsaraz, he is an active sportsman, excelling in football and swimming. As a young man Daniel has developed a keen interest in aviation. He has just started writing his master thesis and he has handed in his research proposal to his company advisor, Leonor Soares Henriques Pais.

Leonor is a senior operations manager for CAP airlines, a Portuguese aviation company. Leonor has been working for CAP airlines since 2008 and he is responsible for ensuring that business operations are efficient in terms of using as little resources as needed, and effective in terms of meeting customer requirements. Leonor's job is quite hectic and ever since he has started, Leonor has been working long hours.

Daniel and Leonor have agreed to meet in a few days to discuss Daniel's research proposal.

### RESEARCH PROPOSAL

#### 1.1 Introduction

The story below is one of the many typical complaints posted on an airline complaint website (<http://www.airlinecomplaints.org/>) describing passengers' experiences with CAP Portugal. CAP is the airline of PLC Travel Group, a leading international travel corporation based in Lisbon.

#### **CAP - Nightmare**

On 23 September 2010 I was flying from Milan to Lisbon and then to Faro with CAP Portugal having the worst experience ever in my life. First of all, the delay from Milan to Lisbon made me to miss flight to Faro. They put me in the next flight 7 hours later which was also delayed for 3 hours and made me to have a total time of 16 hours spend from Milan to Faro which is more than unacceptable. I have had delays with other airlines as well in the past but CAP is something different. They didn't grant me the entrance to their Lounge in order to find some quietness and make some phone calls to reschedule all my appointments which I lost due to their delays. I had to wait for 45 minutes at the transfer desk which was manned only with 4 people; the slowest people I ever seen in my life, helping to form a queue at Lisbon airport of more than 200 meters with people who lost their planes. CAP People were rude, barely English speaking, not helpful at all and when we at last got on a plane they served us a lousy sandwich. From Lisbon to Faro they didn't had the smallest dignity to give us a glass of water, although they knew that we were waiting the whole evening at terminal 2 at Lisbon where we could not even get a sandwich to eat. At my return on 27 September from Faro to Lisbon the CAP Pilot made the worst landing I have ever had in my life with the most people in the plane praying.

CAP means for me "Choose Another Plane!!!!"

PLC Travel Group was formed eight years ago by the merger of First International Holidays with the tourism division of NTI Portugal. PLC Travel Group carries the brands 'Arches', 'Portugal International' and 'CAP', and it is the largest tour operator in Portugal.

PLC Portugal has its own airline company (CAP) and owns a franchise chain of CAP travel agencies. CAP carries out charter and regular flights to medium haul destinations such as the Mediterranean, North Africa and the Red Sea and to long haul destinations such as the Caribbean. Today CAP's fleet consists of three (new) Boeings 737-800 and four (outdated) Boeings 767-300. Because the Boeings 767 are rather outdated they need more maintenance than the average airplane. Despite an intense maintenance program, these planes have a lot of technical problems. Consequently, the long haul fleet of CAP has dealt with a lot of delays recently. New long haul planes have been ordered, but these planes will not be delivered before 2016. This means that more delays will inevitably occur.

For this reason CAP needs to obtain more knowledge on the wait experience of passengers during delays and the effects of this experience on customer satisfaction and the evaluation of the service CAP provides.

This research proposal will address the problem and problem statement in section 1.2. Section 1.3 details the research questions that will help to answer the problem statement. Next, section 1.4 discusses the relevance of the project. Section 1.5 provides a brief description of the research design, whereas section 1.6 includes information on the time frame of this study. Finally, this research proposal will provide a selected bibliography.

## **1.2 Problem Indication and Problem Statement**

Prior research has claimed that service waits can be controlled by two techniques: operations management and/or management of perceptions. For CAP it is very difficult to obtain "zero defects" (no delays). Hence, this project will focus on managing the perceptions of the wait experience: because CAP cannot control the actual amount of delays and wait duration (recall that they work with a number of outdated planes), the company must focus on controlling the customer's perception of the waiting experience. To do this successfully it is important to know the variables that influence the perception of this waiting experience and the possible impact of waiting on customer satisfaction and service evaluations. More specifically, this project focuses on the following problem statement:

*How do delays affect consumers' service evaluations?*



Drawing from prior research in the areas of waiting, service evaluations, attribution theory, and mood theory, hypotheses are generated regarding the relationships among a delay, affect, and service evaluations. The hypothesized relationships are tested in a field setting involving delayed CAP airline passengers.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

To deal with the preceding problem statement, the following research questions are answered:

1. How does a delay affect service evaluations?
2. What are the affective consequences of delays and how does affect mediate the relationship between waiting and service evaluations?
3. How do situational variables (such as filled time) influence customer reactions to the delay?

### **1.4 Relevance**

Regarding the practical usefulness of the research project; this project gives CAP an indication of their level of performance during delays and shows what the effects of this performance are. The results of this project allow CAP to improve its service, to keep people even during delays 'smiling'.

### **1.5 Research Design**

The hypotheses of this study will be tested with a standardized questionnaire. Data will be collected from passengers on delayed medium and long haul flights over a period of two months by the cabin crew. Delays on outbound and inbound flights will be used to gather data from passengers. Flights are only sampled if the post-schedule wait is more than one hour. The passengers are asked to fill out and hand in the questionnaire at the end of the flight (approximately one hour before the airplane will land). Post-flight services, such as luggage pick-up, are ignored for practical reasons. Asking the passengers to fill out a questionnaire after they leave the plane will cause a further delay.

### **1.6 Time Frame**

The time frame necessary for this project is approximately six months. During these six months, periodic reports will be provided on the progress being made.

## 1.7 Selected Bibliography

- Folkes, V. S., Koletsky, S., and Graham, J. L. (1987). A Field Study of Causal Inferences and Consumer Reaction: The View from the Airport. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 534-539.
- Oliver, R. L. (1996). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Richins, M. L. (1987). A Multivariate Analysis of Responses to Dissatisfaction. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 15, 24-31.
- Smith, A. K. and Bolton, R. N. (2002). The Effect of Customers' Emotional Responses to Service Failures on Their Recovery Effort Evaluations and Satisfaction Judgments. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30, 5-23.
- Taylor, S. (1994). Waiting for Service: The Relationship Between Delays and Evaluations of Service. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 56-69.
- Westbrook, R. A. (1987). Product/Consumption-Based Affective Responses and Postpurchase Processes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 258-270.

## QUESTIONS

1. Provide an evaluation of Daniel's problem statement and research questions. Use the following criteria:
  - a. The background of the problem is clear.
  - b. The goal of the research project is clear.
  - c. The problem statement is formulated in a neutral and unambiguous way.
  - d. The problem statement is precise and specific.
  - e. The problem statement is relevant.
  - f. The problem statement is feasible.
  - g. The specific research questions follow logically from the problem statement.
  - h. The specific research questions are precisely written and lead to observable outcomes.
2. Improve the section "Relevance".
3. Do you think that the section "Research Design" provides enough information? Why (not)?
4. Does the section "Time Frame" provide enough information? Improve this section if necessary.
5. Explain how a literature review helps Daniel to solve CAP's problem.
6. Search for three more relevant papers in academic journals. Explain why you have selected these specific papers.



# United States International University

## School of Science and Technology

### MIS 6220 RESEARCH METHODS

#### MID SEM EXAMINATION PART2-PROJECT PROPOSAL PRESENTATION RUBRIC

STUDENT NAME: ..... DATE: .....

Topic Content	Advanced 8	Effective/Developing 6	Less Effective/Introductory 4	Poor 2 or lower
<b>Topic &amp; Context</b> (Total Possible = 8 Points)	Presentation (i.e., first one to two slides) begins in a broad manner and clearly explains the problem to be investigated and defines important constructs.	Presentation starts somewhat broadly, and provides some theoretical or real- world context for the main concept in the study. Definitions and an explanation of the key concept or question is provided, but it could be clearer.	More clarity in the opening may be needed or the Presentation may begin with a definition of the topic but provide very little context for the idea (e.g., may begin immediately with review of previous research). Definitions not provided.	Presentation focuses immediately on the literature review, or no context for the topic is provided.
<b>Problem Statement</b> (Total Possible = 8 Points)	Problem is clearly articulated and well supported by current literature. The presentation demonstrates a Depth of understanding by using relevant and accurate detail. Significance and goals have been Clearly identified.	Problem is moderately articulated and supported by current literature. The presentation shows moderate understanding by using mostly relevant and accurate detail. Significance and goals are moderately described.	Problem is averagely articulated and supported by current literature. The presentation shows average understanding by using mostly relevant and accurate detail. Significance and goals are partially or vaguely described.	Problem is poorly articulated and not well supported by current literature. The presentation uses little Relevant or accurate information. Significance and goals have not Been identified.

<b>Topic Content</b>	<b>Advanced 8</b>	<b>Effective/Developing 6</b>	<b>Less Effective/Introductory 5</b>	<b>Poor 4 or lower</b>
Research Objectives (Total Possible = 8 Points)	Effectively and insightfully develops a set of testable, supportable and impactful study hypotheses or research objectives	Develops a set of testable and supportable hypotheses or research objectives.	Develops hypotheses or research objectives.	Hypotheses or research objectives are not testable or justifiable.
Literature Review (Total Possible = 8 Points)	At least 3 studies per variable/research objective are described clearly and in enough detail for the audience to understand.	At least 3 studies per variable/research objective are described clearly. Connection of a study to thesis may be slightly unclear.	At least 2 studies per variable/research objective are described clearly and in enough detail for the audience to understand OR 3 studies are described in an unclear manner. Connection of 3 studies to thesis may be slightly unclear.	All studies per variable/research objective are described in an unclear manner; connection of studies to thesis is unclear.
Literature Advancement (Total Possible = 8 Points)	A brief summary of the literature is provided, and there is a specific, clear description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know. A clear explanation of how the proposed study idea will answer this question or fill this research gap is included. Specific issues, variables, populations, or methods are mentioned.	A brief summary of the literature is provided, but the description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know could be stated more clearly. An explanation of how the proposed study idea will answer this question or fill this research gap is included, but it could be more specific; or, the author makes a vague call for more research without specifying variables, populations, or methods.	A brief summary of the literature is not provided. The description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know is unclear. There is little justification for why the proposed study idea will be important to this literature, or the author makes a vague call for more research without any specificity.	A brief summary of the literature is not provided. The description of what is missing from this literature or what researchers do not yet know is absent or very unclear. There is no discussion of why the proposed study idea will be important to this literature, or no study is proposed at this point.
Conceptual Framework (Total Possible = 8 Points)	One hypothesis is clearly stated, and directional predictions are made based on the previous literature. They are testable. It is clear what the variables will be and what will be measured	The hypothesis is somewhat unclear in stating what the experimental groups or correlational relationship will be or what will be measured. It may be unclear how the hypothesis links to the literature.	One hypothesis must be stated. No directional prediction about the relation between the variables is specifically stated. It is unclear what the variables will be and what will be measured. A hypothesis with no justification may be included.	No hypothesis is stated and hypothesis is very unclear. Direction does not follow from the literature presented

<b>Topic Content</b>	<b>Advanced 8</b>	<b>Effective/Developing 6</b>	<b>Less Effective/Introductory 5</b>	<b>Poor 4 or lower</b>
<b>Proposed Study (Total Possible = 8 Points)</b>	One suggestion for study is provided. The design is clear, complete, and appropriate to test the hypothesis. Variables are appropriate and operationalized properly.	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is complete and appropriate but not clearly described. Variables are appropriately operationalized but may be simplistic.	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is not complete or the operationalization of the variables is not clear. Measured variables may be simplistic or not appropriate).	One suggestion for study is provided. Design is not appropriate for the hypothesis; variables are not operationalized or not valid.
<b>Method: Participants, Materials, Procedure (Total Possible = 8 Points)</b>	Participants, materials, and procedure are briefly and clearly discussed. Participants, materials, and procedure clearly provide a test of hypothesis and support the study design.	Participants, materials, and procedure are discussed. One of these components may be unclear. Participants, materials, and procedure provide a good test of hypothesis and support the study design.	Discussion misses one of the following: participants, materials, or procedures. It is unclear whether the method provides a good test of the hypothesis or matches the study design.	Discussion misses two or more of the following: participants, materials, or procedures. The method does not accurately test the hypothesis and/or does not match study design.
<b>Proposed Statistics (Total Possible = 8 Points)</b>	One statistical analysis is clearly proposed. This statistical analysis provides an accurate test of the hypothesis and matches the study design.	One statistical analysis is proposed, although slightly unclear. This statistical analysis seems to provide an accurate test of the hypothesis and matches the study design, although this could be clearer.	One statistical analysis is proposed, but in an unclear fashion. The statistical analysis is appropriate for the hypothesis, but not the study design, or vice versa.	A statistical analysis is not proposed, stated unclearly, or is unrelated to hypothesis and/or study design.
<b>PowerPoint Slides (Total Possible = 8 Points)</b>	Each slide displays text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. This may be an outline, photo, table, chart, figure, etc. Visuals are creative or clean, and help the audience remember the presentation.	85% of the slides display text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. Slides contain text that should be replaced by a visual image, such as a chart or figure or unrelated to the topic.	50% of the slides display text in a way that is easy for audience to understand. The slides contain too much text and information that is overwhelming to the audience or too many distracting, unrelated images.	More than 50% of the slides contain too much text and little to no visual images. The slides are hard for the audience to understand.
<b>Time Limit (Total Possible = 8 Points)</b>	Presentation is 8-10 minutes.	Presentation is 8 OR 11 minutes.	Presentation is 6 minutes OR 12 minutes.	Presentation is less than 6 OR more than 12 minutes
<b>Academic Integrity</b>	Quotations AND citations included on slides when citing someone's exact words (including your own). Citations included on slides when citing someone's ideas, theories, etc. References included at end of presentation. Self-plagiarism and plagiarism of other sources not present. If presence of plagiarism, then reduction of final paper grade based on severity and submission of academic integrity violation to SST			
<b>Total Possible Points = 88</b>	Points Earned = /88			
<b>Comment</b>				