

Read the article assigned by your TA and answer the following questions. Answers should be numbered to correspond with the questions below, typed (word processed), and double-spaced. Note that most articles will be missing some of the requested information; you should simply report that the author doesn't state . . . (whatever it is that's missing). All answers must be written as complete sentences.

Standard homework formatting and grading rules apply (i.e., full identifying information and a signed honor code must be included, etc.). Late work will not be accepted unless you have a legitimate, documented reason for being absent the day the assignment is due. You must contact your TA within 24 hours to arrange to turn the assignment in or you will receive no credit.

Your assignment will be graded on completeness, correctness, adherence to instructions, and mechanics. Questions 1-12 are worth 1 point each; question 13 is worth 3.

Questions to answer:

General (1 point each):

1. What is the source of the article (give the name of the newspaper, magazine, website, etc.)
2. What question was being asked and/or hypothesis tested?
3. What type of study was this (be as specific as possible – e.g., observational/case control; experimental lab study; etc.)?
4. Who conducted the study?
5. Who funded the study?
6. Was the study published in a scientific journal or presented at a scientific conference? If so, what/where?

Experimental Design (1 point each):

7. What was the independent variable?
8. What was the dependent variable?
9. What were the control variables/control treatments?

10. What was the sample size?
11. Was the study replicated?
12. What conclusions did the scientists reach based on their findings?

Quality of Reporting (3 points):

13. Assign a letter grade to the quality of the science reporting based on the thoroughness with which the author reported the information indicated in questions 1-12 above. Write two or three sentences justifying your grade (be specific). Use the following grading scale: A = excellent; all pertinent information needed to judge the quality of experiment was thoroughly reported. B = good; one or two important pieces of information were missing, but it was still possible to judge the overall quality of the experiment; C = adequate; more than two important pieces of information were missing, making it difficult to judge the quality of the experiment. D = poor; the author left the audience with too many questions left unanswered; the quality of the experiment is impossible to judge. F = abysmal; the author provided only one or two useful pieces of information.