**Rough Draft**

*SOC 4881 – Population Studies Research Practicum*

**DUE**

*April 29*

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Complete this assignment in your group. Be sure to agree---early---on a division of labor within the group; make sure everyone has a meaningful role and has a way to learn from the assignment. It might be a good idea to meet as a group (in person or virtually) to make a plan.

You have four basic tasks for this assignment:

FIRST, add (a) a title page with the title, names of authors, version/date of the paper, and acknowledgements and (2) an abstract page with the title and an abstract that includes —in 250 words or less — the main topic, research questions, methods, and findings.

SECOND, revise your paper to deal with every comment or suggestion you’ve received from me or your classmates (unless you think the comments or suggestions are wrong or unhelpful).

THIRD, be sure to include your tables and figures in the draft.

FOURTH, see the questions on the page below. Make sure your draft is as strong as possible on all of them.

**GRADING**

This assignment is worth 8 points. Everyone in the group will receive the same score unless I receive (and verify) information that some in the group deserve more/less than others in the group. In those instances, I will communicate with everyone in the group to come to a fair resolution.

Assignments turned in late will receive half credit. Assignments should be emailed to me (in Word format) at [warre046@umn.edu](mailto:warre046@umn.edu).

**TITLE / ABSTRACT**

1. ***Does the title page have the title, the authors’ names, a version date, and acknowledgements (including of Jonas Helgertz and MPC’s Center Grant)?***
2. ***Does the abstract page include the title and a 250 word (or less) abstract that describes the topic, research questions, basic methods, and basic findings?***

**FRONT END**

1. ***From the front end, is it clear what the topic and specific research questions are?***

Are both the topic and the questions clear? Do the research questions follow logically from the introduction?

1. ***From the front end, is it clear why the topic/questions are practically and/or theoretically important?***

Have you made a compelling case that we NEED to answer your questions because the results will (a) have important real-life practical implications and/or (b) be important for the development or advancement of sociological or other ideas/theory.

1. ***From the the front end, is it clear how the research will improve upon prior research?***

Why do we need another study on this topic? Have you critically evaluated the existing research literature, such that the reader has a clear sense of what has been done before, what has not been done, what was good/bad about prior research, and how your new research will build on and/or improve what we already know?

1. ***From the front end, is it clear what your theoretically-informed expectations/hypotheses about what you will find?***

It is clear what you expect to find in terms of results? Have you offered a sound theoretical/logical rationale for WHY you expect those results?

1. ***Is the Front End Well Written, from a Style and Technical Point of View?***

Is the front end clear and logically organized? Is it easy to follow? Is it well written, from a technical (i.e., grammar, sentence structure) point of view?

**METHODS SECTION**

1. ***Did you explain what data you will use (and why?)***

Did you name and describe the data you will use? Did you talk about where the data came from, and explain how records were linked across censuses and mortality records? Did you say how you arrived at your analytic sample … that is, how you selected cases to be included in (or excluded from) the analysis? Did you discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these data versus alternate options?

1. ***Did you explain how you will measure every concept?***

Did you explain exactly and completely how every concept mentioned in your research questions will be measured? Did you discuss the pros and cons of alternate ways of measuring those concepts?

1. ***Did you explain what analytic methods you will use to answer each research question?***

Did you ---separately for each of your research questions---explain exactly what analytic method you will use to answer their research questions? Did you discuss the pros and cons of alternate ways of answering those questions?

1. ***Did you explain what problems you anticipate and how you will overcome them?***

Did you describe potential problems that may arise in your analyses, and how you will handle those problems?

1. ***Is the Methods Section well written, from a style and technical point of view?***

Is the methods section clear and logically organized? Is it easy to follow? Is it well written, from a technical (i.e., grammar, sentence structure) point of view?

**RESULTS/DISCUSSION**

1. ***Does the Results section factually describe the findings --- and avoid interpreting them or including background materials?***
2. ***Is the Results section clearly and logically organized? Is it easy to follow?***
3. ***Do your results speak to your research questions (and only your research question)?***
4. ***Are your tables (and figures, if you have any) clear? Well organized?***
5. ***Does the Discussion section help the reader make sense of the findings? Do you interpret the results in light of the major research questions?***
6. ***From reading the Discussion section, are you clear about how the authors' conclusions add to current knowledge and advance the research literature? If not, what do you suggest the authors do to be clearer?***
7. ***Do the authors describe the limitations of their work --- without throwing the research under the bus? If not, how might the authors revise?***
8. ***Do the authors give the reader ideas about future research others might do in response to the authors' findings? If not, what ideas come to your mind for future research based on the authors' findings?***