**Research Proposal Rubric (2023-2024)**

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. 39 pts)** | **Level 2 (max. 69 pts)** | **Level 3 (max. 100 pts)** | **Score** |
| **Content**  **(max. 30 pts)**  *Level 1 = 9pts*  *Level 2 = 18 pts*  *Level 3 = 30pts* | * All required components are present but one **section**\* does not meet 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* Choice of related literature is limited (less than 12 sources used) or inappropriate (non-scholarly, irrelevant, outdated sources cited) * Handling of related literature (e.g., via   quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing) is poor or inconsistent | * All sections meet word limit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may lack clarity or adequate support * Choice of related literature (12+ sources) is adequate but 1-3 sources may be outdated, irrelevant to the study’s focus or lack credibility * Handling of related literature is acceptable, with 1-2 apparent inconsistencies | * All required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, missing 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 = 2*5*pts*  *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 * Numerous vocabulary, grammar use, punctuation, and spelling errors are apparent * 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 * A few 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 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** (300-400), **Literature Review** (800-1000), **Methods** (300-500), and **Expected Outcomes** (250-400). If the **Literature Review** section is under length, **1 point** will be deducted from the overall score.

\*\* 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, the study’s implications for the scholarly community and other stakeholder groups, and ways of disseminating future research findings*.

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