

## RESEARCH PROPOSAL RUBRIC (DRAFT 1)

[Version: 1 Dec. 2023]

Name: ---

Submission date: --

Return date: --

Content (80%) = \_\_\_\_\_

Composition (20%) = \_\_\_\_\_

Score = \_\_\_\_\_

*Turnitin = ---*

### **Guide to understanding the feedback**

1. The draft feedback is designed to help you process, and not spoon-feed you. Therefore, while I do mark your draft (see item 3 below), I don't flag all its problems. Instead, I record my observations (see Tables 1 and 2) and expect you to revise your work accordingly.
2. Use table 3 to make sense of your score.
3. Legend for the draft markings:
  - L - Line number
  - Gray highlights - Unclear, problematic
  - Yellow highlights, Underline - Ignore these: these are my reading guides.

**Instructions on draft 2:** *Please highlight the revisions by using a different font color.*

**Table 1. Content rubric**

Content Elements (80%)	Remarks	Points
<p><b>Chapter I. Introduction (20 pts)<sup>a</sup></b>  <i>A good introduction (1) properly contextualizes the chosen problem, and clearly describes (2) the nature of current study and (3) the need for it. The contextualization should highlight the communicative and organizational aspect of the proposed study.</i></p>		<p>--/50  <b>--/20</b></p>
<p><b>A. Structure and Rationale (10 x 1.5)<sup>b</sup></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Historical development of the topic</i></li> <li>2. <i>Justification of study: Identification of the research gap &amp; filling the gap</i></li> <li>3. <i>Structure/overview of research</i></li> </ol>	---	
<p><b>B. Research Problem/Objectives (10 x 1)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Congruence of the research questions and objectives</i></li> <li>2. <i>Logical listing of questions/objectives</i></li> </ol>	--	
<p><b>C. Significance of the study (10 x 1)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Contribution to theory or knowledge of a general or specific phenomenon</i></li> <li>2. <i>Value of specific applications of knowledge to be gained</i></li> <li>3. <i>Potential importance of these applications</i></li> </ol>	---	
<p><b>D. Scope and Delimitations (10 x 1)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Boundaries of the investigation</i></li> <li>2. <i>Limitations related to the methodology and generalizability of the results (threats to external validity)</i></li> </ol>	---	

Content Elements (80%)	Remarks	Points
<b>Chapter II. Review of Related Literature (20 pts)</b> <i>A good RRL builds on the context introduced in Chapter I by explaining the relevant knowledge and research done so far on the topic. A good RRL does more than summarizing previous publications; it points out themes and gaps in the field of research and connects these to the current study.</i>		<b>--/20</b>
A. Discussion of concepts and theories from related studies (i.e., journal articles, research reports) and literature (i.e., books) (10 x 1)  B. Synthesis: Themes and gaps (10 x 1)	--	
<b>Chapter III Study Framework (20 pts)</b> <i>A good study framework convincingly argues for the appropriateness of the chosen theory to the research problems/objectives (in chap. I) based on the RRL (chap. II). It shows a logical progression from abstraction to concreteness. Its textual and visual elements are <b>complementary</b> but also <b>self-contained</b>. (In other words, even if I read only the text or only the diagrams, I will still be able to understand the framework.)</i>		--/30  <b>--/20</b>
<b>A. Theoretical &amp; integrated theoretical framework (ITF) if any (10 x 1)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of theoretical framework and ITF to the study</li> </ul>	--	
<b>B. Conceptual (10 x 1)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of the specificity of the concepts in the theoretical framework</li> </ul>	--	
<b>C. Operational (10 x 1)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriateness of the operationalized concepts</li> <li>Hypothesis (if applicable)</li> <li>Operational definition of terms</li> </ul>	---	

Content Elements (80%)	Remarks	Points
For quali. studies: Include only operational definitions.		
<b>Chapter IV. Methodology (20 pts)</b> <i>A good methodology (1) <b>clearly explains</b> how the research will be conducted. It also (2) <b>justifies</b> the methodological choices and (3) covers all sub-questions or specific objectives in chapter I. The (4) correspondence between the procedures and specific questions / objectives is likewise clear.</i>		--/70  <b>--/20</b>
A. Research Design: Specification of the research design B. Variables/Concepts: Specification of the variables/concepts C. Participants/respondents and sampling: Specification of participants and sampling procedure D. Research Instrument/s: Description of the research instrument/s E. Data gathering: Clear description of the procedures for data gathering F. Data Analysis: Clear description of the procedures for data analysis G. Ethical considerations	---	
<b>References</b> (see Table 2)		
<b>Appendix/-ices</b> Includes the draft of the questionnaire		
<b>TOTAL: CONTENT SCORE</b>		<b>--/80</b>

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> The score per chapter is transmuted based on the weighted points per criterion.

<sup>b</sup> The notation "(10 x number)" stands for the weighted score per item.

**Table 2. Composition rubric**

Composition elements (20%)	Remarks	Points
<p><b>A. Grammar and mechanics</b> (10 x 2) Follows standard American English</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ---</li> </ul>	
<p><b>B. Style</b> (10 x 1) Uses the academic writing style as shown in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formal word choice (<i>Register</i>)</li> <li>2. Appropriate use of hedges and boosters (<i>Metadiscourse</i>)</li> <li>3. Explicit / clear sentences</li> <li>4. Compliant with the APA style guidelines for the presentation of figures and tables</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ---</li> </ul>	
<p><b>C. Organization</b> (10 x 2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effectively uses coherence strategies within paragraphs</li> <li>2. Effectively uses of coherence strategies <b>above</b> the paragraph, namely: sectional overviews, transitions, and summaries at strategic locations</li> <li>3. Logically groups ideas for a smooth flow of topics</li> </ol>	<p>---</p>	

Composition elements (20%)	Remarks	Points
<b>D. Format</b> (10 x 0.5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complies with the modified APA format as discussed in class</li> </ul>		5
<b>E. Documentation</b> (10 x 2) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complies with the APA format for in-text citation and the appropriate level of citation (no overcitation or undercitation)</li> <li>Complies with the APA format for in-text citation and reference section</li> </ol>	--- ---	
<b>TOTAL: COMPOSITION SCORE</b>		--/75  <b>--/20</b>

**Table 3. Scoring guide based on a 10-point scale**

Numerical Score*	Description
10	Demonstrates all qualities for the criteria all the time Description: <i>Consistent, complete, always</i> (e.g., The grammar is <i>always</i> correct.)
8	Shows most of the qualities with only up to two minor problems (i.e., problems that do not affect my understanding of the paper) Description: <i>Most of the time</i>
6	Either of these cases:

	<p>a) shows one major flaw, i.e., one that affects my understanding of the paper or causes reading difficulties (such as poor organization)</p> <p>b) shows up to four minor problems</p> <p>Description: <i>Sometimes</i></p>
5	<p>Any one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• shows both cases listed for 6 points</li> <li>• shows more than 1 major flaw</li> <li>• shows more than 4 minor problems</li> </ul> <p>Description: <i>Hardly (ever)</i></p>
0	Missing part, example: no ethical considerations

\*Note: In-between scores can also be given.