Final Proposal and Presentation (33%)

Note: This file will be reuploaded with a more detailed rubric for the proposal.

Students will give a brief presentation (following up from their flash talk) before writing a research proposal that that contains an overview of the relevant literature pertaining to their chosen research topic, as well as proposing research questions, methodology, and discussing potential outcomes and implications of the research. Students are expected to integrate feedback from mid-semester assessments (flash talk and mind map). You are welcome to come to office hours or ask for feedback between the final presentation and the proposal.

Disclaimer: If you use ChatGPT (or similar programs) for anything related to this assessment – you must provide an appendix disclosing this that provides any prompts and explanation of what you had it do. We must be able to see which ideas were your own. You are expected to have read all materials you include and reference, and you are responsible for the accuracy of all information.

Presentation (8%)

Presentations should be brief (~5 minutes, with a maximum of 6 minutes). The goal of this presentation is a more concrete pitch of "this is what I am going to do". We are looking for clarity and specificity with respect to your project. We will be looking for a specific research question and brief but clear methods (e.g., be specific and not vague in the explanation you provide) that refine your earlier idea. Your presentation should include a quick acknowledgement of how you used peer feedback to inform this version of your proposed project. Finally, you must discuss what concrete results or outcome you might expect (and what this might mean for the big picture/how they interpret the results).

Slides should be submitted on Canvas before you present. For this presentation, there will be no questions.

Some tips:

- Stating the research question and methods should be no more than 50% of your presentation.

- The research question should be a narrow and concise statement that is testable within the COGS 402 timeframe (or longer if you give a different timeline).

Proposal (25%)

Proposals will be maximum 8 pages double spaced and in 12-point font. This page limit does not include tables, charts, graphics, or other figures.[1] You will also include a reference list and bibliography, as well as a reflection. The reference list/bibliography and reflection do not count toward page limit.

---

[1] If the text itself is clearly beyond 4 pages by more than a few lines after accounting for any figures/tables, we will stop reading at the point that would be 4 pages and there will be a minor deduction.

All three components should be submitted in a single file in PDF, DOC, or DOCX format.[2] Submissions consisting of URLs will not be accepted for the proposal. *(We must be able to directly download all proposal files from Canvas.)*

Citations and references should be in a standard reference format. I strongly prefer APA or MLA, but I will accept whichever format is the main choice in your area.

Proposal (19%)
Your proposal should include the following:

- Background (in sufficient detail to motivate the RQ/hypothesis)
- Research Q/Hypothesis
- Proposed Methods[3]
- Expected Results/Interpretation of Results
- Brief Description of a Planned or Ideal Lab and/or Supervisor for the Project
- Significance/Contributions

Your proposal should be written in language that is accessible for a non-expert academic, *particularly* in the background section. Proposed lab/supervisor do not have to be one you have talked to or confirmed; we are looking for you to identify a reasonable supervisor/lab at UBC that could be a good match and motivate this choice.

Reflection (5%)
In addition to the proposal, you will include a write-up discussing the feedback you received over the term and how it affected your final proposal. This will include formal feedback from peers, TA, or instructor. Include (copy-paste) the feedback and note who it came from.

Summarise any big picture feedback (things that have bigger consequences or were recurring themes across feedback). Then, address which feedback you chose to implement (and why), as well as which you chose to set aside.

You do not need to motivate your choice for minor suggestions, but we expect discussion of at least five more substantial suggestions that include discussion of how you used and implemented the feedback or a well-motivated explanation for why you chose to set it aside. *(You must implement/explain at least two substantial suggestions. Do not worry about disagreeing with the person giving the feedback, just ensure you provide a good argument.)*

Bibliography (1%)
In addition to your reference list (works cited in proposal), provide additional references that are not cited in your proposal will support your project. This includes papers that you may eventually need to read or work related to your topic (e.g., in a competing framework or from a different perspective). You do not need to read everything in this list; we will be evaluating this with respect to titles and how you have anticipated what kind of literature may be relevant or important at various stages of the project.

---

[2] If you would like to submit in another file format, please let me know before the due date.
[3] See below (under tips) for an example of the kind of methods and results you may describe if your project is more theory-based.

Some Tips for the Proposal:

- All figures that you do not make should have a citation (with a page number if it comes from a paper or book).
- If you use something that generates citations for you (e.g., Google Scholar), make sure that the references are formatted correctly. *(I have not tested this, but if your references are a mess of ALL CAPS and inconsistent punctuation… this might be a place where getting AI to reformat might save you time? Just make sure to acknowledge in an explicit statement at the end if you use AI and for what to ensure you're following the academic honesty guidelines for the course.)*
- If you are citing something that another person has cited, make sure you use a secondary citation (or whatever is stated in the citation style you pick).
- Page numbers are needed for direct quotes or very specific information taken from a paper (e.g., statistics or very specific claims that are not the big point of the paper).
- Feel free to look at my example SSHRC proposal (which Laura discussed in class) to get a sense of how you could structure and frame the background of the proposal for a non-expert academic audience.
    - SSHRC's wording: "Write your proposal in clear, plain language. Avoid discipline-specific jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms when writing your program of work."

- For both the presentation and proposal: If your project is more theoretical (not experimental) – the methods and anticipated outcomes may be different in nature, but you should still have specificity in them. Ask me in office hours if you are unsure.
    - For example: My dissertation is in phonological theory.
        - **Methods:** I use a methodology that involves a survey of the literature on 23 Salish languages using primary fieldwork, archival sources, and published material. I code each type of reduplication across these sources on several dimensions (meaning, position, shape, and form). I then apply and refine a particular set of theoretical assumptions (e.g., Prosodic Morphology, GNLA) to provide detailed case studies of two languages with supplementary follow-up elicitation to test predictions. I then evaluate whether the theoretical framework resulting from my analyses can extend to the remaining of the 23 languages. The scope of your project is obviously smaller than this, but any of these steps could be described in more detail for the proposal to provide adequate specificity in a methodology.
        - **Possible Results:** If my theoretical approach is correct, I expect all observed variation to be along a handful of dimensions including underlying form, constraint ranking, and morpheme-to-strata mapping. If there are types of reduplication that do not fit that, such as those that motivate a segmental template or BRCT approach, this will challenge my proposal that reduplication is fission motivated by a need to repair prosodic structure *(and so on…)*