Appendix A

The Checklist

From

SCORING CHECKLIST FOR CONTENT IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH REPORTS

Part I

Name(s): ____________________________

Semester: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

DIRECTIONS:

For each of the following statements, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree to the corresponding ratings of students, according to the scale below. (Note: Any statements which are not applicable will automatically receive a "strongly agree" rating.)

1=strongly disagree  2=disagree  3=neutral  4=agree  5=strongly agree

CONTENT

Title:

1. The title makes clear the population of interest. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The title makes clear the primary independent variable(s). 1 2 3 4 5
3. The title makes clear the dependent variable(s). 1 2 3 4 5
4. The title indicates the specific relationship between the major variables. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided. 1 2 3 4 5

Abstract:

6. A clear rationale for the study is provided. 1 2 3 4 5
7. There is an explicit purpose statement. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The purpose statement flows logically from the rationale. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The purpose statement makes clear the population/cases of interest. 1 2 3 4 5
10. The purpose statement makes clear the primary dependent variable. 1 2 3 4 5
11. The purpose statement indicates the specific relationship between the major cases/variables. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The purpose statement is consistent with the title. 1 2 3 4 5
13. The (approximate) sample size and group sizes are provided. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The sample size is consistent with the type of generalization suggested by the title, purpose statement, and research question. 1 2 3 4 5
15. If a sample was selected, at least one of the 24 sampling schemes identified by Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2006) is specified accurately. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Sufficient data collecting procedures are clearly described. 1 2 3 4 5
17. The research design is specified clearly and accurately. 1 2 3 4 5
18. It is specified adequately how the data were analyzed. 1 2 3 4 5
19. The major findings are summarized adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Implications of the findings are summarized adequately. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Generalizations made (e.g., analytical, statistical, case-to-case transfer) suggest interpretive consistency. 1 2 3 4 5
22. The abstract does not contain more than 120 words. 1 2 3 4 5
Introduction/Literature Review:

23. An explicit statement of the problem is present. 1 2 3 4 5
24. The statement of the problem is stated in the opening paragraph. 1 2 3 4 5
25. Adequate background information is given on the problem presented. 1 2 3 4 5
26. All background information given on the problem is relevant. 1 2 3 4 5
27. The statement of the problem leads smoothly to the next paragraph. 1 2 3 4 5
28. Quotations are avoided, and are only used when paraphrasing would lead to a loss of meaning or representation. 1 2 3 4 5
29. Every statement of fact is supported by one or more citations. 1 2 3 4 5
30. All findings from previous research are supported by one or more citations. 1 2 3 4 5
31. The literature review is comprehensive (i.e., the review contains at least 20 citations that are complete and exactly consistent with the citations presented in the reference list). 1 2 3 4 5
32. All references cited are relevant to the problem under investigation. 1 2 3 4 5
33. All or almost all of the sources are primary. 1 2 3 4 5
34. Most of the references are current. 1 2 3 4 5
35. The literature review explicitly relates previous studies to the problem. 1 2 3 4 5
36. The literature review section contains appropriate number of subheadings. 1 2 3 4 5
37. At least some of the references have been critically analyzed. 1 2 3 4 5
38. The references have been compared and contrasted. 1 2 3 4 5
39. The review logically flows in such a way that the references least related to the problem are discussed first and the most related references are discussed last. 1 2 3 4 5
40. Clear connections are made between the present study and the previous research. 1 2 3 4 5
41. All conceptual/theoretical terms are directly/operationally defined. 1 2 3 4 5
42. A clear conceptual/theoretical framework is presented. 1 2 3 4 5
43. The conceptual/theoretical framework is associated with one or more appropriate citations. 1 2 3 4 5
44. The review concludes with a brief summary. 1 2 3 4 5
45. The summary is an adequate representation of material that was presented previously. 1 2 3 4 5
46. The summary does not contain new information that should have been introduced earlier. 1 2 3 4 5
47. A clear rationale for the study is provided. 1 2 3 4 5
48. There is an explicit purpose statement. 1 2 3 4 5
49. The purpose statement flows logically from the rationale. 1 2 3 4 5
50. The purpose statement makes clear the population of interest. 1 2 3 4 5
51. The purpose statement makes clear the primary dependent variable. 1 2 3 4 5
52. The purpose statement indicates the specific relationship between the major cases/variables. 1 2 3 4 5
53. The purpose statement is consistent with the title. 1 2 3 4 5
54. The research problem is researchable. 1 2 3 4 5
55. One or more explicit research questions are presented. 1 2 3 4 5
56. The research questions follow the purpose statement. 1 2 3 4 5
57. Each research question makes clear the population of interest. 1 2 3 4 5
58. Each research question makes clear the primary dependent variable. 1 2 3 4 5
59. The educational significance is stated explicitly. 1 2 3 4 5
60. This section of the proposal is well-integrated (i.e., flows well). 1 2 3 4 5
61. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided.

**Method**

### Participants

62. The (approximate) population/context size is provided.  
63. The major characteristics of the population are described adequately.  
64. The selection-eligibility criteria are described adequately.  
65. If a sample was selected, at least one of the 24 sampling schemes identified by Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2006) is specified accurately.  
66. If a sample was selected, the sampling scheme is described clearly and accurately.  
67. An adequate rationale is provided for choice of sampling scheme.  
68. Evidence is presented that the sample of words/observations (i.e., sample space) represented the population of words/observations (i.e., truth space) for the underlying context.  
69. The (approximate) sample size and group sizes are provided.  
70. The sample size is consistent with the type of generalization suggested by the title, purpose statement, and research question.  
71. The sample size is adequate for the research design.  
72. The major characteristics of the sample are described adequately.  
73. The relationship of the researcher to the participants are fully described (e.g., participant observer, non-participant observer, collaborator).  
74. The role of the researcher is described clearly (e.g., neutral, collaborative, objective).  
75. Evidence of ethical considerations is provided adequately.  
76. This section of Chapter 3 is well-integrated (i.e., flows well).  
77. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided.

### Instruments

78. An adequate rationale is given for the selection of each instrument.  
79. Each instrument is described adequately in terms of purpose and content.  
80. The developers of all instruments are specified clearly.  
81. The format of the items (e.g., open-ended) is specified clearly/accurately.  
82. Citations are provided for all statements of facts and research findings pertaining to the characteristics of the instruments.  
83. Each instrument appears to be appropriate for measuring the intended phenomenon/variables.  
84. Evidence is given that each instrument is appropriate for the sample.  
85. Each instrument appears to be appropriate for the sample under study.  
86. Adequate information is provided which indicates that administrators, observers, or interviewers were well trained.  
87. If an instrument was designed specifically for the study, the procedures involved in its development are described adequately.  
88. Samples of interview central questions, issue subquestions, and topical subquestions are provided.  
89. Interview questions/subquestions are described as basic descriptive, follow-up, experience/example, simple clarification, structural/paradigmatic, and comparison/contrast (Janesick, 2004).  
90. Type of interview is specified (e.g., unstructured, partially structured, semi-structured, structured, totally structured).  
91. All interviewers are identified clearly.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92. Location of interview is specified (i.e., interviewee=s workplace)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Length of interview is specified (i.e., short vs. long)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Estimated number of interviews is specified (e.g., single vs. multiple).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Format of interviews is specified (e.g., formal vs. informal).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Samples of focus group questions are provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Samples of probes to questions are provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. All observational data collection techniques are described adequately.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. All observation protocols used (e.g., Flanders, 1970) are described adequately.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. The type of observations is specified using Fontana and Frey’s (2005) categorization (i.e., kinesic, proxemic, chronemic, paralinguistic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Observer is classified as peripheral member, active member, or complete member (Adler &amp; Adler, 1987)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Observation is classified as descriptive observation, focus observation, or selective observation (Werner &amp; Schoepfle, 1987)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. All documents that were analyzed are identified clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. This section of the proposal is well-integrated (i.e., flows well).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106. All data collecting procedures are clearly described.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. The study was conducted for an appropriate length of time for the predicted outcomes to be observed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. The training of data collectors is clearly described and adequate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. The ethical nature of data collection method is discussed adequately.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. The research paradigm used is clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. The philosophical correlates of the research paradigm are specified clearly (e.g., hermeneutics, post-positivist, post-structuralist, post-modernist, constructivist, feminist, idealist).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Citations are provided for selected correlates of research paradigm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. The assumption(s) of research paradigm are provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. The research design is stated clearly and accurately.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. If a case study design is used, the type of case study (i.e., instrumental, intrinsic, collective/multiple; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009) is identified and described clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. If a phenomenological design is used, the type of phenomenology (i.e., reflective/transcendental, dialogical, empirical, existential, hermeneutic, social, psychological; Creswell, 2007) is identified and described clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Adequate justification is provided for the research design used.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Information is provided about how the research design may evolve as the process unfolds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Citations are provided when describing the research design used.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. The design appears to be appropriate for answering the research question and/or testing the hypothesis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Evidence is provided that the researcher was not the sole voice of the participant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Evidence is provided that any interviewers did not influence the content of the interviewee=s/focus group=s description in such a way that these descriptions do not truly affect the actual experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Evidence is provided that all transcripts were accurate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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124. The form of all collected data is adequately described (e.g., field notes, audio tapes, videotapes, referential material). 1 2 3 4 5
125. Evidence is provided that rich data were collected. 1 2 3 4 5
126. Evidence is provided that the data sources were well chosen. 1 2 3 4 5
127. Evidence is provided that the number of data sources was adequate. 1 2 3 4 5
128. Evidence is provided that data were collected in a systematic manner. 1 2 3 4 5
129. It is described adequately how entry into the research context was obtained. 1 2 3 4 5
130. At least one verification procedure is described in detail (e.g., prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, contextualization of observations, method of constant comparison, checking for representativeness of sources of data, checking for researcher effects, weighing the evidence, examining extreme cases, checking for spurious relations, examining rival explanations, looking for negative evidence, obtaining feedback from informants, leaving an audit trail, thick description, assessing structural relationships, use of referential material, theoretical sampling). 1 2 3 4 5
131. No important verification procedures are omitted. 1 2 3 4 5
132. This section of Chapter 3 is well-integrated (i.e., flows well). 1 2 3 4 5
133. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided. 1 2 3 4 5

Legitimation
134. The discussion of threats to Verification/Trustworthiness/legitimation/Authenticity/Credibility/Transferability/Dependability/Confirmability of data is adequately undertaken using a framework (e.g., Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1991, 1993; LeCompte & Goetz, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1984). 1 2 3 4 5
135. Each legitimation threat discussed is labeled appropriately. 1 2 3 4 5
136. Citations are provided when referring to threats to legitimation. 1 2 3 4 5
137. All important threats to legitimation are discussed. 1 2 3 4 5
138. At least one verification procedure is described in detail (e.g., prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, contextualization of observations, method of constant comparison, checking for representativeness of sources of data, checking for researcher effects, weighing the evidence, examining extreme cases, checking for spurious relations, examining rival explanations, looking for negative evidence, obtaining feedback from informants, leaving an audit trail, thick description, assessing structural relationships, use of referential material, theoretical sampling). 1 2 3 4 5
139. Citations are provided when referring to each verification procedure. 1 2 3 4 5
140. Appropriate citations are always provided, where relevant. 1 2 3 4 5
141. This section of the report is well-integrated (i.e., flows well). 1 2 3 4 5
142. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided. 1 2 3 4 5

Analysis
143. It is specified where the responsibility or authority for the creation of categories resided—that is the loci of origination is described adequately (i.e., participants, programs, investigative, literature, or interpretive). 1 2 3 4 5
| 144. It is specified the grounds on which one could justify the existence of a given set of categories (i.e., external, rational, referential, empirical, technical, or participative). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 145. The source of the name used to identify a given category was identified (i.e., participants, programs, investigative, literature, or interpretive). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 146. It is specified at what point during the research process that the categories was specified (i.e., *a priori*, *a posteriori*, or iterative). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 147. It is specified adequately how the emergent categories were analyzed. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 148. It is specified adequately whether a variable-oriented analysis or a case-oriented analysis (or both) was analyzed. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 149. It is clear whether exploratory or confirmatory techniques (or both) was used. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 150. All qualitative software are specified (e.g., QDA Miner, NVIVO, Ethnograph). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 151. Citations are provided for all qualitative software identified. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 152. This section of Chapter 3 is well-integrated (i.e., flows well). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 153. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**Results**

| 154. Each theme is defined clearly and adequately. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 155. Each theme is contextualized adequately. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 156. Each theme is described clearly and adequately. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 157. Appropriate evidence is used (e.g., quotations) to represent each theme. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 158. Where appropriate, major themes are differentiated from minor themes. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 159. Where appropriate, expected (i.e., confirmed) themes are differentiated from unexpected (emergent) themes. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 160. Where appropriate, themes are connected and interrelated. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 161. Where appropriate, meaning is represented via visual displays. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 162. Where appropriate, meaning is represented via tabular/matrix displays. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 163. Where appropriate, effect sizes pertaining to the frequency and/or intensity of themes are presented. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 164. An appropriate narrative is used for representing and reporting the findings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 165. Appropriate metaphors and analogies are used in the narrative discussion. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 166. The data presented address adequately all research questions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 167. The sample of words/observation (i.e., sample space) appeared to represent adequately the population of words/observations (i.e, truth space) for the underlying context (i.e., qualitative power was sufficiently large). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 168. Thick, rich data are presented clearly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 169. All results are presented clearly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 170. All tables used are well organized and easy to understand. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 171. All figures used are well presented and easy to understand. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 172. Information in each table/matrix is described adequately in the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 173. Data in each figure are described adequately in the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 174. Data in each table/matrix are consistent with the information provided in the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 175. Data presented in each figure are consistent with the information provided in the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
176. This section of Chapter 4 is well-integrated (i.e., flows well).  
177. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided.

Discussion

178. Each major result is summarized adequately.  
179. Each significant result is interpreted with respect to the associated meaning or effect size.  
180. The interpretations of the findings do not appear to be biased.  
181. Each result is discussed adequately in terms of the original research question to which it relates.  
182. Each result is discussed adequately in terms of its agreement or disagreement with previous results obtained by other researchers in other studies.  
183. All generalizations made are consistent with the results.  
184. All theoretical generalizations made are confined to the population from which the sample was drawn.  
185. Personal reflections of the researcher about the meaning of the data are delineated clearly.  
186. Personal views are compared or contrasted adequately with the literature.  
187. Limitations of the study are discussed adequately.  
188. No important limitations are omitted.  
189. Theoretical and practical implications of the findings are discussed adequately.  
190. The implications of the findings logically flow from the findings of the study.  
191. It is made clear how the findings add to the current body of literature.  
192. Recommendations for future action are made adequately.  
193. The recommendations for future action stem directly from the practically and/or statistically significant findings.  
194. Recommendations for future research are provided adequately.  
195. The recommendations for future research stem from the findings.  
196. The recommendations for future research appear to extend the body of knowledge in the area.  
197. This section of Chapter 5 is well-integrated (i.e., flows well).  
198. Vague, ambiguous, and emotional-laden terms have been avoided.

Reference List

199. All citations provided in the text are contained in the reference list.  
200. All citations provided in the reference list are contained in the text.  
201. The names of all authors provided in the text are consistent with the names presented in the reference list.  
202. All authors are presented in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
203. All titles are written accurately and in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
204. All publication dates in the reference list are consistent with those in the text and are written in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
205. All sources are written accurately and in strict adherence to APA guidelines.  
206. Every aspect of the reference list strictly adheres to APA guidelines.
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207. The appendix section contains samples of any researcher-made instruments. 1 2 3 4 5
208. All researcher-made instruments appear to be appropriate for the study. 1 2 3 4 5
209. The appendix section contains appropriate qualitative software output. 1 2 3 4 5
210. All researcher-made instruments appear to be appropriate for the study. 1 2 3 4 5
211. The appendix section contains appropriate number of informed consent forms. 1 2 3 4 5
212. Each informed consent form is written appropriately for the intended reader. 1 2 3 4 5
213. Each informed consent form contains all important information. 1 2 3 4 5
214. The information provided in each informed consent form is consistent with the information provided in the methods section. 1 2 3 4 5

Number of Occurrences:

Number of points assigned:

TOTAL SCORE FOR RESEARCH Report OUT OF 1070:

PERCENTAGE SCORE FOR RESEARCH Report:

RUBRIC EQUIVALENT SCORE OUT OF 60:
Qualitative Report Scoring Checklist for Quality of Writing and Adherence to APA Style

Part II

Name(s):

Semester: Date:

DIRECTIONS:

For each of the following statements, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree, according to the scale below. (Note: Any statements which are not applicable will automatically receive a strongly agree rating.)

1 = strongly disagree  2 = disagree  3 = neutral  4 = agree  5 = strongly agree

Title Page

1. The title page contains all essential components. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The page header adheres strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The page header text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
4. The running head adheres strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
5. The running head text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5
6. The title adheres strictly to APA guidelines. 1 2 3 4 5
7. The title text is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5

Introduction/Literature Review

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal (including repetitive information). 1 2 3 4 5
3. This section of the proposal is informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the report is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5

Method

Participants

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal (including repetitive information). 1 2 3 4 5
3. This section of the proposal is informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the report is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout.  
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).  

**Instruments:**

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the  
   proposal (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.  
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate.  
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions.  
6. This section of the report is comprehensive.  
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to  
   APA guidelines (including margins).  
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout.  
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).  

**Procedure:**

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the  
   proposal (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.  
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate.  
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions.  
6. This section of the report is comprehensive.  
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to  
   APA guidelines (including margins).  
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout.  
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).  

**Legitimation:**

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the  
   proposal (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.  
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate.  
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions.  
6. This section of the report is comprehensive.  
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to  
   APA guidelines (including margins).  
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout.  
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality  
   (e.g., grammar, punctuation).  

**Analysis:**

1. This section of the report contains all the salient information.  
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the  
   proposal (including repetitive information).  
3. This section of the proposal is informative.
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the report is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5

Results
1. This section of the report contains all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal (including repetitive information). 1 2 3 4 5
3. This section of the proposal is informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the report is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The writing in this section of the report is of high quality (e.g., grammar, punctuation). 1 2 3 4 5

Discussion
1. This section of the report contains all the salient information. 1 2 3 4 5
2. No inappropriate information is presented in this section of the proposal (including repetitive information). 1 2 3 4 5
3. This section of the proposal is informative. 1 2 3 4 5
4. This section of the report is entirely accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
5. This section of the report does not contain any contradictions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. This section of the report is comprehensive. 1 2 3 4 5
7. This section of the proposal is written in strict adherence to APA guidelines (including margins). 1 2 3 4 5
8. This section of the report is clearly written throughout. 1 2 3 4 5
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(2 = Material presented in this section is *more* than was required)
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