

MOT1452 Guidance for Proposal & Group Paper

Checkpoints/submission dates:

- 1st submission group paper topic proposal 1-2 pager (May 21st)
 - Fill in buddy check (May 21st)
- 2nd presentation & feedback of nearly final draft (June 10th)
- 3rd submission of draft plagiarism check (June 11th)
- 4th final submission (June 17th)
 - Fill in buddy check (June 18th)

1. Background

Students are required to write a research paper that reconstructs and evaluates a decision-making process about a case of their choice (in groups of 4-5). The case can be about any real-life complex decision-making problem that (tries to) addresses a real world (super) wicked problem. Note that in your paper, you are analyzing the decision *process*—not the decision *content*.

2. Topic proposal

In week 5 of the course on **May 21st, 2024**, you will *propose the topic/case* that you intend to analyze, in a **maximum of 500 words** (approx. one PDF page).

You are free to choose any real-world decision-making process that interests you and meets the following criteria:

- It must concern a *wicked* problem; involve multiple actors; conflicting viewpoints, and *negotiations or interactions that have already happened*.
- It must be well-documented—you need at least 3 references for now (and >10 sources for the final paper).
- Technology should play a prominent role (i.e., avoid purely political or social topics).

In your proposal, include the following:

1. Name your group number and members, and the title of your topic/case
2. Briefly and coherently introduce your decision-making process
3. Argue the underlying (super) wicked problem (use 2-3 arguments)
4. Point out a 1-2 key conflicts; and 1-2 concrete negotiation moments
5. If the decision-making time line/scope is very broad, specify your focus
6. Provide 3 references (use author-date style) related to your case
7. Attached a draft of your Team Contract.

You will receive feedback on the topic which you can consider adopting in your report.

3. Submission & feedback

The topic proposal, full draft, and final papers all need to be submitted **via Brightspace** (in PDF format). Make sure you are enrolled with your peers in one of the free groups first, and that use the correct assignment folder. You will receive feedback via Brightspace.

You will have an opportunity to received feedback from your markers prior to submitting on **June 10th, 2024**. Please come prepared with questions related to your report. You will be allocated a timeslot during the lecture time to receive feedback.

4. Paper structure & elements

Your group project is due after the end of the course on **June 17th, 2024**.

The final deliverable is a research paper that meets the topic requirements above. The word limit is **3,500** (excluding the cover page, reference-list, and any appendices; the paper should be around 16 pages). There is a flexibility of $\pm 10\%$ of the word count.

You are free to structure their final paper in any way they deem fit, as long it contains all the required parts mentioned below. Note that the paper must **read as a coherent narrative from start to end**. Papers must include the following parts:

1. Introduction Section:

- *Introduce* the decision-making challenge (with the essential background; if it is a broad topic, clarify the scope);
- *Argue* briefly why this difficulty is (a symptom of a) *wicked problem*;
- *Introduce* the paper's research question.

2. Method

- Describe the method of your research. How did you find your information: e.g. secondary research, lecture readings (refer to the literature itself and not the lecture slides), interviews if applicable,
- Describe how you used chatGPT/other AI tools, for editing, summarising etc.

3. Descriptive & Analysis Section:

- *Describe* the decision process (the what, when=timeline, how, who=actors) as a short *story*; be sure to clarify the incentives and stances of the main actors.
- *Reconstruct* the decision process using theory (motivate chosen models and concepts).
- *Reflect* on the *perspectives and (potential) conflicts* of different *actors* and reflect on their motivation/values in the decision-making process.

4. Conclusion/Discussion Section:

- *Conclude* by answering the RQ (based on your analysis; don't introduce new facts or arguments);
- Provide reflexive *recommendations*, which are recommendations or strategies that challenge/question the existing attitudes of the decision-making process/stakeholders. This includes discussing why such decision-making processes and practices might marginalize/exclude other stakeholder groups or cause negative impacts on stakeholders/broader society.
- Identify

Other comments: papers must also form/structure and argumentative requirements:

- *Layout*: use an informative title; provide author information (name, student number, and study program of both students); proper section headings; and include page numbers.
- *Clarity* is key—reasoning and explanations should be easily understood; so obviously there shouldn't be spelling or grammatical errors; ensure each paragraph deals with one main point.
- *Argue* based on your case evidence and the course theory; (considering competing/counter arguments is a plus);
- *Referencing*: Use APA, Chicago, or another established author-date style, and ensure all ideas/quotes/figures/sources are references.
- ChatGPT: use chatGPT/other AI tools like any other reference, as one point of evidence and put in quotes " " the sentence you use verbatim. For further guidance see "How to cite ChatGPT": <https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt>

Group Paper Appendix: Team Charter

In the group project Appendix Include the Team Contract under:

A. Project Expectations:

- Detail the goals, level of quality, and acceptable outcome(s) for the project.
- Describe how the team will distribute contribution to the project equally among members and how to address inequality of member contribution throughout the project.

The template below is a guidance- please feel free to adjust where needed.

Team Work Distribution Table

Section of the group report	Planned allocation of work <i>(indicate group member name)</i>	Actual work done <i>(group member name)</i>	Comments <i>(If needed)</i>
1. Introduction			
1.1 Context...			
1.2 Research question and summary of paper...			
2. Method			
3. Descriptive & Analysis Section			
3.1 Decision making process...			
3.2 Reconstructing decision process with theory...			
3.3 Negotiation and strategies...			
4. Conclusion /Discussion Section			
4.1 Discussion...			
4.2 Summary/synthesis...			
4.3 Recommendations...			

Include signatures:

Group member 1: (Name and date)

I hereby agree/disagree with the table contents (if disagree please provide justification)

Group member 2: (Name and date)

I hereby agree/disagree with the table contents (if disagree please provide justification)

Group member 3: (Name and date)

I hereby agree/disagree with the table contents (if disagree please provide justification)

Group member 4: (Name and date)

I hereby agree/disagree with the table contents (if disagree please provide justification)

Group member 5: (Name and date)

I hereby agree/disagree with the table contents (if disagree please provide justification)

5. Supervision & feedback

You may ask questions about the paper during or immediately after lectures. You may also discuss them in up to three private meetings throughout the course. (Time slots will be announced.) Simple questions can be answered via email, but I generally discourage email for this purpose as it's not a good place for complex discussions or deep understanding. General questions can also be posted in the form.

The following resources are all available on Brightspace: lecture slides and course literature; general tips for better writing.

6. Assessment criteria

Your work needs to meet the following requirements to be marked:

- Group paper topic proposal
- Team Charter + Team Work Distribution Table

Your work will be assessed using these criteria (RUBRIC):

Criteria	Grade: Excellent (10) or Very Good (8)	Grade: Sufficient with Some Deficiency (6)	Grade: Major Deficiencies (4) or Missing (2)
C1: Effective Introduction	Paper introduces the decision-making difficulty (with the essential background & scope); Paper argues why it is (a symptom of a) wicked problem Paper has a suitable and explicit research question	These elements (decision difficulty, wickedness, RQ) exist but are problematic or incomplete	The elements are very weak
C2: Sufficient Case Research	Paper describes the timeline of events (the what, when, how, by whom) in its story line; Paper mentions key actors (with their stance, interests, and resources where appropriate) in its story line	These elements (timeline, actors) exist but are problematic or incomplete	The elements are very weak

Criteria	Grade: Excellent (10) or Very Good (8)	Grade: Sufficient with Some Deficiency (6)	Grade: Major Deficiencies (4) or Missing (2)
C3: Correct Decision Reconstruction (using models)	Paper motivates the chosen model(s); Reconstructs the decision process using the model and theory correctly; Note that any chosen model has its own criteria (as discussed in the slides) which need to be met	Minor mistakes in application of the model	Major mistakes in application of model
C4: Adequate Analysis of Strategies	Paper identifies important negotiation strategies used by actors; Paper identifies major alliances formed by actors; Paper identifies strategies used by actors in at least one key moment.	2 out of 3 of the elements exist with only minor mistakes	Only 1 out of 3 elements exist without major mistakes;
C5: Effective Conclusion	Paper concludes by answering the RQ (based on analysis; without introducing new information); Offer recommendations (which also follow analysis and are supported by theory) OR: discusses/reflects on its findings (e.g. broader implications, what remains puzzling, etc)	One of conclusion or recommendations/discussions weak	Both weak
C6: Sound Argumentation	Clarity of the writing is key—reasoning and explanations should be easily understood; no major spelling or grammatical errors; Each paragraph should deal with one main point (with coherent transition among them); Arguments should be based on case evidence and theory (also avoiding normative language); Considering competing/alternative explanations makes the paper excellent.	Coherent & clear, but doesn't consider competing/counter arguments	Incoherent text; hard to make sense of arguments
C7: Correct Layout & Referencing	Paper has proper layout: an informative (and not too wordy) title with author information; proper section headings; page numbers; Paper uses APA or Chicago (both author-date) referencing style, and ensure all ideas / quotes / figures / sources are referenced. Transparent use of ChatGPT/AI tools (use of tool is not mandatory)	Either layout or the referencing have major issues Demonstrates critical and robust use of references including ChatGPT/AI tools (use of AI tool is not mandatory)	Both weak