

## Brain Games and Video Games Annotated Rubric Score

ROW ONE: The response earned 2 points for this row because it implicitly identifies a research question that is vague in scope and starts with a bias that video games do, in fact, "boost brain power." The vague reference to improving "brain power" creates a lack of clear focus for the area of inquiry, and the connection to the stimulus materials is implied rather than explicitly stated or cited. In [this document](#), look for the YELLOW highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW TWO: The response earned 2 points for this row because it offers a superficial representation of objections and refutations related to the central argument. It briefly mentions research findings that video games do not improve fluid intelligence and then discredits the author instead of addressing the research findings. The essay inconsistently evaluates both sides of the implications or limitations of the various perspectives. For example, Jonides's findings are briefly mentioned and not explored in more depth. In [this document](#), look for the GREEN highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW THREE: The response earned 4 points for this row because it interprets and synthesizes evidence from a wide range of sources. For example, sources include scholarly articles from the fields of psychology, science, and education. The interpretation of the sources is at times superficial or omitted altogether. There is inconsistency in interpretation and synthesis of the wide range of sources, however, which keeps The response in the middle score range on this row of the rubric. In [this document](#), look for the BLUE highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW FOUR: The response earned 4 points for this row because it distinguishes among various pieces of evidence in terms of their relevance and credibility. The essay has an extensive works cited comprised of scholarly and peer reviewed journals. The essay consistently offers source credentials or refers to source expertise such as the reference to Cherry, Miller, and Jaeggi's research. The response also differentiates among author credibility but inconsistently and on a relatively superficial level. For example, the response mentions research conducted by Cherry, and then suggests the validity of the research is low because the author is a freelance writer. In [this document](#), look for the RED highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW FIVE: The response earned 2 points for this row because it is logically organized and while the reasoning is not faulty, it is overly simplistic. The conclusions offered, such as suggesting teenagers play Call of Duty because it will improve multitasking skills, are overly generalized or are restatements of existing findings. In [this document](#), look for the PINK highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW SIX: The response earned 4 points for this row because it links some of its claims and evidence, including the claim that HiFi improves the memory test scores of adults with the study by Machnuke. However, while the essay links claims and evidence it uses minimal commentary to link the two, simply offering a claim, a piece of corroborating evidence, and occasionally a transition to the next topic. In [this document](#), look for the GREY highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW SEVEN: The response earned 2 points for this row because it attributes and cites most of the sources and information with a reasonable amount of accuracy, and although there are both stylistic and mechanical errors, these are relatively minor. The bibliography appears to be consistent and complete. In [this document](#), look for the TEAL BLUE highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.

ROW EIGHT: The response earned 1 point for this row because it contains flaws in style and grammar that interfere with communication to the reader. These instances are present consistently throughout the response. In [this document](#), look for the OLIVE GREEN highlighted phrases or sentences that show evidence for the scoring of this row.