

A-Paper

1. The paper makes a logical argument for why we should care about political discussion. In doing so, the paper draws on outside resources beyond the readings assigned in this class.
2. The paper makes a logical argument for why we should care that political discussion takes place online and connects it to the argument for why we should care about political discussion.
3. The paper clearly describes how the group collected the data, so that another person could replicate the study.
4. The paper clearly and logically defines key concepts and how they were identified (measured) in the forums. In addition, the paper explains how the researches checked for inter-coder reliability and reports the results of the inter-coder reliability check.
5. The paper presents the analysis in a way that is easy to understand and draws logical conclusions from the results.
6. The paper clearly explains how the results relate to Mutz and Wojcieszak and makes logical inferences.
7. The paper is well written, clearly organized, and free of any grammatical or spelling errors.

B-Paper

1. The paper makes a logical argument for why we should care about political discussion. In doing so, the paper draws on outside resources but does not go beyond the readings assigned in this class.
2. The paper makes a logical argument for why we should care that political discussion takes place online but doesn't connect it to the argument for why we should care about political discussion.
3. The paper clearly describes how the group collected the data, so that another person could replicate the study.
4. The paper clearly defines key concepts and how they were identified (measured) in the forums. In addition, reports the results of the inter-coder reliability check.
5. The paper presents the analysis in a way that is easy to understand and draws conclusions based on the results.
6. The paper explains how the results relate to Mutz and Wojcieszak
7. The paper is well written, clearly organized, but has several spelling and grammar errors.

C-Paper

1. The paper provides an argument for why we should care about political discussion, but is hard to follow. In doing so, the paper draws on outside resources but does not go beyond the readings assigned in this class.
2. The paper makes an argument for why we should care that political discussion takes place online, but is hard to follow.
3. The paper describes how the group collected the data, but might be difficult for someone to replicate their study.
4. The paper defines key concepts and how they were identified (measured) in the forums, but it is hard to distinguish one concept from another. In addition, reports the results of the inter-coder reliability check.

5. The paper analysis that is presented is difficult to understand and but the conclusions that are drawn are logically based on the analysis.
6. The paper explains how the results relate to Mutz and Wojcieszak
7. The paper is hard to follow and has several spelling and grammar errors.

D-Paper

1. The paper provides an argument for why we should care about political discussion, but it is illogical or does not draw on outside sources.
2. The paper makes an argument for why we should care that political discussion takes place online, but is illogical.
3. The paper describes how the group collected the data, but it is so unclear that it could not be replicated.
4. The paper does not define key concepts. In addition, reports the results of the inter-coder reliability check.
5. The paper presents the analysis in a way that is difficult to understand and draws conclusions that are not based on the results.
6. The paper explains how the results relate to Mutz and Wojcieszak.
7. The paper is very hard to follow and has many spelling and grammar errors.

F-Paper

1. The paper does not provide an argument for why we should care about political discussion.
2. The paper does make an argument for why we should care that political discussion takes place online.
3. The paper does not describe how the group collected the data.
4. The paper does not define key concepts and does not report the results of the inter-coder reliability check.
5. The paper presents the analysis in a way that is difficult to understand and draws conclusions that are not based on the results and are illogical.
6. The paper does not explain how the results relate to Mutz and Wojcieszak.
7. The paper is very hard to follow and has numerous spelling and grammar errors.