

goals:

- 1) argument
 - a. specific, nuanced, interpretive thesis appropriate to the assignment
 - b. clear, compelling connections and analysis carry readers through the logic of your argument
- 2) evidence
 - a. argument is supported by and convincingly interprets the data
 - b. thoughtful, productive selection and use of evidence from the interviews
 - c. does not omit data because it is inconvenient *but also* does not include data irrelevant to the report's thesis/focus
 - d. detailed, original analysis
- 3) structure
 - a. each clearly-labeled section (introduction [unlabelled], methods, results, discussion, conclusion [possibly the last paragraph of the discussion]) does its particular job effectively and fits clearly into the report as a whole
 - b. strong, sensible organization within sections (including good paragraphing and meaningful transitions)
- 4) audience (written for social scientists)
 - a. style appropriate to the social sciences: clear, precise, accurate, and concise, avoiding overgeneralization and overstatement
 - b. careful presentation of methods, population, limitations of the data, etc.; appropriate use of social science terminology
 - c. does not assume readers' familiarity with or interest in our class or college
- 5) mechanically neat and tidy

evaluation:

- excellent (A-range): Fulfills all of the above criteria completely.
- very good (B-range): Fulfills all of the criteria but lacks depth, precision, or polish in one or two.
- acceptable (C-range): At least basically fulfills the criteria but has problems in multiple areas *or* a major problem in one.
- unacceptable (D/F): Fulfills none of the criteria to its full potential or completely fails in one or more.

**** must fulfill required length: shorter papers receive proportionately partial credit ****