

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 Choice of related literature is limited (less than 12 sources used) or inappropriate (non-scholarly, irrelevant, outdated sources cited) 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 Choice of related literature (12+ sources) is adequate but 1-3 sources may be outdated, irrelevant to the study's focus or lack credibility 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