**Research Proposal Rubric (2019-2020)**

Note: **0,5 bonus points** can be added to the overall grade on one extra aspect of **content** that exceeds the reader’s expectations (e.g., mastery of theoretical concepts).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Level 1 (max. 42 pts)** | **Level 2 (max. 74 pts)** | **Level 3 (max. 100 pts)** | **Score** |
| **Content**  **(max. 30 pts)**  *Level 1 = 12pts*  *Level 2 = 21 pts*  *Level 3 = 30pts* | * All required components are present but ONE **section**\* is below word limit requirements * Reflects limited understanding of subject matter * Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills and/or ability to elaborate on or justify ideas * If present, arguments are often unclear, incoherent or lack support from literature * Choice of related literature is limited (less than 12 sources used) or inappropriate (non-scholarly, irrelevant, outdated sources cited) * Handling of related literature (e.g., via   quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing) is poor or inconsistent | * All required components are present and meet word limit requirements but one section does not fully address **all content requirements**\*\* * Reflects adequate grasp of subject matter * Demonstrates acceptable critical thinking skills yet some ideas may be irrelevant to the study’s focus, conceptually flawed or ambiguous * Arguments are generally coherent and clear but some may lack clarity or adequate support * Choice of related literature (12+ sources) is adequate but 1-3 sources may be outdated, irrelevant to the study’s focus or lack credibility * Handling of related literature is acceptable, with 1-2 apparent inconsistencies | * All required components are present and meet word limit requirements, and all main sections are elaborated at the required level of detail * Reflects mastery of subject matter * Demonstrates excellent skills of critical inquiry, analysis, discussion, and justification * Arguments are superior and effectively supported with evidence from various sources * Choice of related literature is appropriate (relevant, current, authoritative sources used) * Handling of related literature demonstrates skilled use of quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing strategies |  |
| **Organization**  **(max. 21 pts)**  *Level 1 = 9pts*  *Level 2 = 15pts*  *Level 3 = 21pts* | * At least one section lacks a clear focus and/or logical progression of ideas * Paragraph division is poor * Use of link words and conjunctions is minimal, repetitive or largely inaccurate | * All sections have a clear focus but the progression of ideas within some may be faulty * Paragraph division is not always effective * Some (1-3) link words and conjunctions may be repetitive or used inaccurately | * Demonstrates a clear and logical progression of ideas within/between all sections * Paragraph division is coherent and effective * Appropriate and varied link words and conjunctions are used effectively throughout |  |
| **Language and quality of writing**  **(max. 35 pts)**  *Level 1 = 15pts*  *Level 2 = 27pts*  *Level 3 = 35pts* | * Deviations from academic style are frequent * Academic language shows little familiarity with international research writing norms * Tense forms are often inappropriately chosen or used inaccurately * There are numerous vocabulary, grammar use, punctuation, and spelling errors * There are very few to no instances of **hedging\*\*\*** where hedging is required | * Style is appropriate, with 1-3 minor inconsistencies * Academic language is generally authentic but a few repetitions or inaccuracies are apparent * There may be 1-3 inaccuracies in overall choice/use of tense forms * Additional (up to 5) vocabulary, grammar use, punctuation, and spelling errors are apparent * Use of hedging is acceptable but not consistent | * Style is appropriate throughout * Academic language is specific to research writing, varied, and used accurately throughout * Tense forms are appropriately chosen for a range of functions and used effectively * Vocabulary, grammar use, punctuation, and spelling errors are rare (1-3) and not noticeable * Hedgingis used effectively throughout |  |
| **Format**  **(max. 14 pts)**  *Level 1 = 6pts*  *Level 2 = 11pts*  *Level 3 = 14pts* | * Formatting of the proposal (headings, font, spacing, margins, indentation, bolding, etc.) largely deviates from task requirements * Formatting of cited sources using APA is largely inaccurate, inconsistent or flawed | * Formatting of the proposal is acceptable, with   1-3 apparent inconsistencies (headings, etc.)   * Formatting of cited sources using APA (in-text references/reference list) is acceptable, with   up to 4 apparent inconsistencies | * Formatting of the proposal meets all task requirements, with 1-3 minor inconsistencies * Formatting of cited sources using APA (in-text references/reference list) is generally effective but may require 1-3 minor revisions |  |

**Total: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

\*Apart from the abstract (150-200), the main sections include the **Introduction** (400-500), **Literature Review** (800-1000), **Methods** (300-500), and **Expected Outcomes** (250-400).

\*\* Main sections should include *topic importance, context* (where necessary)*, in-depth review of previous research* (using mostly scholarly sources FIVE of which should be non-Russian; a few special-interest websites are allowed where necessary)*, research gap, the study’s purpose and research questions, research design, justification of proposed data collection and analysis methods, the study’s scope and limitations, expected outcomes* and *implications for the scholarly community and other stakeholder groups*.

\*\*\* Students are expected to use hedging when discussing the proposed study’s significance and implications, and when interpreting their own and other scholars’ views, assertions, and findings.