

**Grading Criteria**

|   | <b>A</b>  | <b>B</b>   | <b>C</b>  | <b>D-F</b>  | <b>Possible (100 tot.)</b> |
|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Research Question (theory)</b>   | <p>Clearly and eloquently identifies a research question.</p> <p>The question is one that can be addressed ethnographically, and the grammatical structure of the question represents the structure of the actual problem (the foundation of the project).</p> <p>The research question is unpacked for the reader so that it is clear what problem the proposed research will address, including the context of the question and the structure of the problem (e.g., if it is a comparative question, the comparison is clear; if it is an explanatory question, the explanatory nature of it is clear, etc.).</p> <p>The question has theoretical implications (ranging from idiographic to nomothetic theoretical concerns).</p> <p>(18-20 points)</p>   | <p>The proposal contains a clear research question, but there are minor ambiguities as to what the proposed research will address, or potential ambiguities regarding the structure of the question.</p> <p>The research question is not completely unpacked or contextualized, so that some minor questions remain as to what the research is seeking to accomplish. This may include failing to unpack the details of the structure of the question or problem that is guiding the research.</p> <p>The question has theoretical implications, but they are not articulated thoroughly.</p> <p>(16+ points)</p>  | <p>The proposal contains a research question, but it remains ambiguous or imprecise. It is not clear either what the proposed research will address, or how the question is structured.</p> <p>The research question is not adequately unpacked or contextualized, so that some major questions remain as to what the research is seeking to accomplish. This may include failing to unpack the details of the structure of the question or problem that is guiding the research.</p> <p>The proposal fails to articulate sufficient theoretical implications of the research question.</p> <p>(14-15 points)</p> | <p>The proposal has serious deficiencies or fails to articulate an adequate research question.</p> <p>(≤ 13 points)</p>   | <b>20</b>                  |
| <b>Literature</b>   | <p>The proposal contains a serious (non-superficial) review of the academic literature pertaining to the proposed research question. This literature review clearly and compellingly demonstrates how the proposed research will contribute to scholarship on the topic.</p> <p>(14-15 points)</p>  | <p>The proposal contains a decent review of the academic literature pertaining to the proposed research question. This literature review demonstrates how the proposed research will contribute to scholarship on the topic, but could have been argued more clearly or compellingly, or could have included more academic sources to provide context for scholarship on the topic.</p> <p>(12-13 points)</p>  | <p>The proposal contains a superficial review of the academic literature pertaining to the proposed research question, or a review of literature that is not clearly academic or relevant to the research topic. This proposal fails to completely demonstrate how the proposed research will contribute to scholarship on the topic.</p> <p>(10-11 points)</p>   | <p>The proposal fails to provide an account of academic literature related to the proposed research topic, or this review is superficial at best and does not situate the question in the academic literature.</p> <p>(≤ 9 points)</p>                                  | <b>15</b>                  |
| <b>Interesting Factor</b>   | <p>A clear and compelling case is made as to why the proposed research is "interesting" (Davis 1971), and how it will challenge the assumptions of some community in some interesting way.</p> <p>(4.5 - 5 points)</p>  | <p>A case is made for the research being "interesting" (Davis 1971), but could have been made more thoroughly.</p> <p>(4 points)</p>   | <p>The proposal merely states that the research question is interesting in some way, but fails to defend this statement.</p> <p>(3.5 points)</p>  | <p>There is no serious attempt in the proposal to defend why the proposed research might be "interesting" (Davis 1971).</p> <p>(≤ 3 points)</p>   | <b>5</b>                   |
| <b>Methods (and data)</b>   | <p>The proposal contains a clear and complete methods section that fully articulates methods of data collection and analysis. These methods are articulated in a sufficient degree such that the reader can imagine the actual contexts (or sites) where the researcher proposes to collect data, as well as the details of how the researcher plans to go about collecting and analyzing those data.</p> <p>These articulated methods of data collection and analysis clearly relate back to the proposed research question, and a strong case is made in the proposal that the resulting data will allow the research to pose a convincing ethnographic response to the research question.</p> <p>The logical connections between theory-method-data are clearly and compellingly articulated in all cases.</p> <p>(27-30 points)</p> | <p>The proposal contains a largely clear and complete methods section that articulates methods of data collection and analysis. These methods are articulated to such a degree that the reader can largely imagine the contexts (or sites) where the researcher proposes to collect data and the details of how the researcher plans to go about analyzing those data, but perhaps omits some detail leaving minor questions about what this will look like.</p> <p>These articulate methods of data collection and analysis relate back to the proposed research question, but a stronger case could have been made in the proposal that the resulting data will allow the research to pose a convincing ethnographic response to the research question.</p> <p>The logical connections between theory-method-data are good and mostly articulated for the reader, but could have provided more detail.</p> <p>(24-26 points)</p> | <p>The proposal substantially articulates methods for the research, but contains significant omissions, painting a less-than-complete picture of what the researcher will actually do in their fieldwork. Significant questions remain about what the whole body of data that the researcher plans to collect look like, how these data will be analyzed, or how these data will relate back to the research question at hand.</p> <p>(21-23 points)</p>  | <p>The proposal fails to articulate a detailed methodological plan to undertake ethnographic research that would address a meaningful research question that is outlined in the proposal.</p> <p>(≤ 20 points)</p>  | <b>30</b>                  |
| <b>Organization</b>   | <p>Organization of proposal as a whole is logical and quickly apparent.</p> <p>Logical connections between concepts, paragraphs, and sections are clearly articulated.</p> <p>Transitions between paragraphs and sections are smooth.</p> <p>Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point, expressed in a clear topic sentence; the parts of each paragraph connect logically and persuasively, and internal transitions are smooth.</p> <p>(14-15 points)</p>   | <p>Organization of proposal as a whole is logical and apparent, but transitions between paragraphs are not consistently smooth.</p> <p>The logic connecting different elements of the proposal (theory-method-data) are articulated, but could have been done so more convincingly.</p> <p>Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point and, for the most part, the parts of each paragraph connect logically and effectively.</p> <p>In all but a few cases, the paragraph's point is expressed in a clear topic sentence.</p> <p>(12-13 points)</p>   | <p>Organization of the proposal as a whole can only be discerned with effort.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>The proposal fails to articulate logical connections between different elements (theory-method-data, for example).<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Not all the parts of the proposal are effectively integrated. In a number of paragraphs, there is not a distinct or coherent point.<br/>(and/or)<br/>Topic sentences are missing or unclear in a number of paragraphs.<br/>(and/or)<br/>The parts of the proposal do not connect logically.</p> <p>(10-11 points)</p>  | <p>Organization of the proposal as a whole is not logical or discernable.</p> <p>(≤ 9 points)</p>   | <b>15</b>                  |
| <b>Clarity</b>  | <p>Throughout the proposal, wording is precise and unambiguous.</p> <p>Sentence structure is consistently clear and lucid.</p> <p>Quotations are all framed effectively in the text (i.e. integrated properly in terms of both grammar and meaning) and explicated where necessary.</p> <p>(9-10 points)</p>  | <p>Proposal is for the most part precisely worded and unambiguous.</p> <p>Sentence structure is mostly clear.</p> <p>Quotations are framed effectively in the text.</p> <p>(8 points)</p>  | <p>Wording is imprecise or ambiguous fairly often.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Sentence structure is often confusing.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Quotations are not framed effectively in the text.</p> <p>(7 points)</p>  | <p>Throughout the proposal, wording is imprecise or ambiguous.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Sentence structure is consistently confusing.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Grammar issues severely hamper the reader's ability to follow the content of the proposal.</p> <p>(≤ 6 points)</p> | <b>10</b>                  |
| <b>Mechanics</b><br><br>For each grammatical mistake .5 points will be deducted | <p>Proposal is clean and appropriately formatted.</p> <p>There are no incomplete or run-on sentences.</p> <p>Quotes are all properly attributed and cited.</p> <p>There are virtually no spelling or grammatical errors.</p> <p>All cited material is appropriately cited in the text and the paper using Chicago (Author-Date) formatting and the proposal includes a complete and properly formatted references cited section at the end.</p> <p>(4.5 - 5 points)</p>   | <p>There are a few minor spelling or grammatical errors.</p> <p>Quotes are all properly attributed and cited.</p> <p>One or two minor errors in the in-text citations or references cited section, which largely follows the Chicago (Author-Date) format.</p> <p>(4 points)</p>   | <p>There are a number of spelling and grammatical errors.<br/>(and/or)<br/>In a few places, quotes and references needing citation are not attributed and cited properly.<br/>Citations are largely complete, but not in the correct format.</p> <p>(3.5 points)</p>  | <p>Proposal is unacceptably sloppy.<br/>(and/or...)<br/>Quotes are frequently not attributed or improperly cited.<br/>There are serious gaps in the level of citation, either in text or in the references cited section.</p> <p>(≤ 3 points)</p>                       | <b>5</b>                   |