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About the Course
I created an Ethnographic Research Project and Class Presentation to be used in Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (ANT 112). This course is comprised mostly of first-year students, many of whom have not yet declared a major and are unfamiliar with anthropology.

How the Assignment Fits Into the Course
The assignment is a collaborative project that encourages students to apply what they have learned about culture to food. It also gives them a chance to learn first-hand what it feels like to do ethnographic research. I assign students to a research team (6 teams of 5 students) in which they explore Elon food culture using a specific lens (such as kinship) that corresponds to a chapter in the course textbook. Three teams conduct their research and present it prior to the midterm, and three afterwards. Having presentations throughout the term allows me to give focused feedback to 1-2 groups at a time, and also helps the students to view the textbook chapters as comprised of linked rather than discrete topics since all the projects are about food and culture but the lens used to study it is different.

Aims for the Assignment
The aims for this assignment are to engender the development of reading, writing and research skills, to encourage students to see these three aspects of learning as connected, and to apply the concepts and methods we learn in class to a real-world issue.

Important Features of the Assignment
This assignment is broken up into five smaller assignments. The first assignment builds upon a short assignment (a Reading Journal) that students complete several times over the semester. After it is completed, I meet with each group to give them written and oral feedback on how to proceed with the rest of the project. The students receive feedback via email for each step thereafter, although they can also schedule time to meet me. Each group submits both an electronic and a paper copy of each assignment (the paper copy is kept in a group binder) so that their progress is apparent to both the students and me. The final assignment is an oral presentation that is evaluated solely by peer review: other groups evaluate the
presenting group, and each presenter evaluates their team members and themselves as well.

The directions for this assignment are long (17 pages in total). However, students only read about 3 pages at a time. It also includes several pages of rubrics and peer evaluation forms.

**Changes Made to the Assignment**

I made a few key changes to this assignment at the Writing Excellence Summer Institute. First, I broke up the assignment so that it was comprised of five assignment sheets and corresponding rubrics or peer review sheets. Inclusion of the rubrics allowed me to emphasize the importance of direct application of both the textbook definition of culture as well as relevant terms from the textbook chapter that corresponds with the group’s project. Second, I cut the number of articles students read for the Mini Lit Review to ensure that they have more opportunities to collectively read, write about, discuss, and apply the information from the source they read. In other words, students spend more time on fewer sources. This allowed me to highlight the importance of skill development, such as reading and writing, which is critical for good research. This is reflected in the use of the Reading Journal for the Mini Lit Review, and the increased number of chances for feedback and revision. These changes should result in improved reading-writing-thinking skills, deeper understanding of and engagement with concepts in anthropology, and better end products.
The Assignment I Distribute to Students

ANT 112 – Intro to Anthropology
Ethnographic Research Project

Subject
Eating at Elon: Student Food Culture at our University

Audiences
Written paper for your instructor, oral presentation for your classmates

Overview
This is your chance to try out the ethnographic methods we have read about and talked about in class! To ensure that the project is manageable and interesting, I have decided that you will be interviewing your fellow Elon students about a topic that most people have a lot to say about: FOOD. You will be assigned to a research team of five students. As a member of this team, you will take the role of an ethnographic researcher who is working collaboratively to understand one of the following aspects of Elon’s food culture: Origins and Diversity, Social Identity, Subsistence, Economics, Kinship, and Religion (these are chapter topics from the textbook). Your team will do some background reading on that aspect of food culture, formulate a research question and interview questions, and summarize your results in the context of what you read and what you have learned about culture in the research paper. You will also present your findings to your classmates. Both the written paper and the oral presentation are evaluated as group work, so it is imperative that each member share the responsibilities equally.

By the end of the class, your research and peer review of other teams’ research will have required you to engage with 5-6 anthropological dimensions of food and culture; you will have applied your knowledge of culture in general to Elon food culture specifically; and you will have honed your skills in collaborative research.

Process
This project will be made up of five smaller assignments that will be submitted for feedback and evaluation. Assignment sheets and rubrics for each of these steps are available on Moodle. You will also be required to evaluate yourself and your group members, as well as other groups. These peer evaluation forms are also available on Moodle for your review, but I will provide them to you in class. The due dates for each component of the project are in the calendar in the syllabus (also on Moodle). Because of the importance Elon places on understanding the connections between reading, writing, and critical thinking, we will explore these connections in this project.
Connection to Course Goals and to the Elon Writing Excellence Initiative
This assignment addresses the following course/EWEI goals (listed in the syllabus)

1. Learn how to think like an anthropologist by doing a mini literature review and basic ethnography (Write to learn, write in a discipline)

2. Learn how to write about contemporary issues (in this case, food) in terms of culture and other relevant anthropological terms (Write to learn)

3. Learn how to translate your research into an oral presentation for the class (present as a citizen)

To meet these goals, you will
1. Utilize the skills you have been honing with the Reading Journal, particularly summarizing authors’ arguments with reference to the components and characteristics of culture

2. Synthesize the information from your textbook chapter and 2 additional sources (provided by your instructor) in an integrated summary where you describe how the authors you read relate an aspect of culture through food (or vice versa)

3. Develop a central research question (CRQ) based on the literature review

4. Develop interview questions and a methodology for conducting 5-10 minute interviews of Elon students (20 for the group)

5. Analyze your qualitative data and summarize your findings in writing

6. Discuss the challenges you faced and what parts of the project were rewarding/interesting in writing

7. Write up each of these steps as part of an ethnographic research project (the audience is your instructor)

8. Submit all your notes, drafts, and final product to the instructor in a large, 3-ring binder

9. Present your work to the class and answer questions from the audience (your classmates)
### Research Project Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Peer review</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Lit Review and CRQ</td>
<td>Dr. R.</td>
<td>Summarize sources and use that to formulate a CRQ</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>within your group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Interview Questions and Memo</td>
<td>Dr. R./Interviewees</td>
<td>Formulate interview questions and carry out interviews</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview Guide</td>
<td>within your group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Rough draft</td>
<td>Dr. R.</td>
<td>Combine lit review, interview data, data analysis, and other materials into a draft for feedback</td>
<td>Research Paper Draft</td>
<td>within your group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Final paper</td>
<td>Dr. R.</td>
<td>Submit your research in polished form</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>within your group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Presentation</td>
<td>Your classmates</td>
<td>Present your research to stakeholders</td>
<td>Oral Powerpoint Presentation</td>
<td>within your group</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due dates for each group are in the syllabus. You can write your own dates here for your convenience.*
Assignment #1: Mini Literature Review and 3 Potential Central Research Questions (CRQ)

3-4 pages, 30 points

The first step of this project is to get a basic understanding of your topic from the textbook and the readings I will provide for you. This is called a Mini Literature Review, and will be the first section of your research paper.

Complete the Mini Lit Review by going through the following steps

1. Read the Haviland chapter that corresponds to your topic, noting important concepts (ALL partners). You do NOT need to do a Reading Journal for the step.

2. Read the two articles (selected by the instructor) in the same manner we have been reading outside articles – by using the reading journal document on Moodle (designated there as “Reading Journal for Project”). Each research partner should read ONE of the articles. Make sure that at least 2 teammates read the same article.

3. Meet with your group outside of class. Compare your reading journals. Discuss the ways in which each author’s research shows that food reflects culture. Refer to the 5 characteristics of culture outlined by Haviland to keep you focused. I recommend writing a diagram or list to help you connect the authors’ work to culture and other relevant terms from your chapter in Haviland. TAKE NOTES!

4. Designate a research partner to convert the points you covered in your discussion into a lit review. The lit review will integrate the ideas from the two articles and key concepts from your chapter in Haviland (see the rubric for details). This person becomes “Partner 1.” Assign everyone else a number and circulate the draft in order from partners 1 to 5, adding information about their respective journal articles as necessary using the Track Changes function in Word. Partner 5 will edit the document, ensuring it is free from errors and follows the standards listed in the syllabus, prepare the bibliography in APA style, and email it to the instructor by the date on the syllabus.

5. While in your group meeting, formulate 2-3 possible Central Research Questions about food culture at Elon based on what you talked about as a group. Partner 2 will record the questions, edit them, and email them to the Partner 5 so that the assignment can be submitted as one document. (** The summary should be 4 pages, and questions should follow the citations and be on a separate page.)

6. Meet with the instructor to discuss your progress. Bring a) your reading journals for the project articles (ALL PARTNERS!), b) the notes from your discussion, and c) one copy of the integrated summary and possible CRQs
to the meeting in a LARGE 3-ring binder. Submit them to your instructor for feedback at the end of the meeting.

Summary of duties
All partners read the textbook chapter and one article, making sure to use the reading journal. All partners attend the group meeting.

Partner 1 converts the discussion points/notes to a lit review.

Partners 2-5 add information to the lit review as the document circulates.

Partner 2 collects the proposed Central Research Questions, edits them, and sends them to Partner 5.

Partner 5 edits/formats the lit review, completes the citations, adds the CRQ list to the document, and emails it to the instructor.

Group #_______________________
Partner 1:_______________________
Partner 2:_______________________
Partner 3:_______________________
Partner 4:_______________________
Partner 5:_______________________
Rubric for Assignment #1

Meeting threshold: You MUST format the document according to parameters in the syllabus, and your document MUST be in the range required for the assignment. Failure to do so will result in me returning your assignment to you, and you re-submitting it when the error(s) have been fixed. You will also lose points for turning in a late assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-1)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (3)</th>
<th>Outstanding (5)</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the argument/thesis/main idea from each article</td>
<td>The research team failed to explain the argument (main point) of all the articles clearly, or relied on the original language from the text without proper citation.</td>
<td>The explanation of 1 of 2 articles was vague or relied too much on author (rather than student) language or failed to cite properly.</td>
<td>The explanation s of both theses were explained in clear, concise language. Students wrote in their own words and/or cited properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draws connections (similarities, differences) between the meat of the arguments in the articles</td>
<td>All connections are superficial in that they do not compare the importance of what is argued (ex, focus on small details rather than arguments/main ideas).</td>
<td>Some connections are superficial, but most demonstrate the team’s ability to compare and contrast the main arguments.</td>
<td>Students demonstrated their team’s ability to compare and contrast the main arguments in the articles with precision and accuracy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied the concept of culture, with attention to components/characteristics</td>
<td>References to components/characteristics of culture are misapplied.</td>
<td>References are applied correctly but may be unclear in some instances.</td>
<td>References are applied correctly and clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied RELEVANT terms from the Haviland chapter</strong></td>
<td>Contextualization of the terms (why these particular terms are important in relation to the arguments in the articles) is absent; the terms selected may be inappropriate.</td>
<td>Contextualization of the terms may be vague, or some terms may not be appropriate.</td>
<td>Contextualization of appropriate terms is clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APA Bibliography</strong></td>
<td>There are multiple errors in format.</td>
<td>There are a few errors in format.</td>
<td>There are no errors in format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRQ</strong></td>
<td>Questions require significant revision because they are not clearly related to readings and/or are impractical.</td>
<td>Questions require some revision because connections to readings may not be clear or they may be impractical.</td>
<td>Questions can be used as they are because they are practical and draw from the literature in appropriate ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment #2: Formulation of Interview Questions and Methods

Methods – 2 pages, Questions – 1 page, 20 points total

Once your CRQ has been approved, each research partner will brainstorm interview questions. This can be done in person or over email. Each partner should contribute 4-5 questions from his/her brainstorm session. You may want to use different types of questions, such as yes/no questions, multiple choice questions, or free-listing questions. However, you will want to focus on open-ended questions to ensure you get some good qualitative information from your interviewees. Partner 3 will collect all the questions, put them in a logical order (think about how a normal conversation would flow), edit them, and email them to the instructor along with the methods and explanation supplied by Partner 4 (see below) by the deadline in the syllabus.

You need to consider what population at Elon you want to target and how you will select the 20 people you will interview (decide on your methods). It is also important to be able to explain your research to the people you want to interview. Discuss your methods and what you will say to your prospective interviewees, either in person or over email. Partner 4 will write up the methods the group has agreed on (about 1 page) and prepare a short explanation of your group’s project (about half a page) in which you tell the interviewee about the class, what your objective is, and what types of questions you want to ask. Partner 4 will email them to Partner 3 so that the two documents can be combined and submitted as one to the instructor by the deadline on the syllabus.

Once the instructor has provided feedback, you can begin your interviews. Each person in the research team must interview 5 Elon students. Before the interview, PRINT the question sheet. As you conduct the interview, fill in the interviewee’s answers with a pen or pencil. It is not necessary to write down everything word-for-word, but write down all the main points so that your research partners can understand what the person said. Make sure you thank the students for agreeing to be interviewed. KEEP the interview sheets and place them in the team’s binder. These will be submitted with Assignment #3.

Summary of duties:

All partners should contribute interview questions, and provide input about methods and how to phrase the explanation of research to interviewees. All partners will interview 4 students.

Partner 3 will collect, edit, format and submit the questions (after adding the methods from Partner 4)

Partner 4 will write up the methods and the statement for prospective interviewees and email them to Partner 3.
Rubric for Assignment #2:

Meeting threshold: You MUST format the document according to parameters in the syllabus, and your document MUST be in the range required for the assignment. Failure to do so will result in me returning your assignment to you, and you re-submitting it when the error(s) have been fixed. You will also lose points for turning in a late assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-1)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (3)</th>
<th>Outstanding (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Questions are not related to the CRQ, are primarily quantitative, are not engaging, and/or are inappropriate for the target time.</td>
<td>Most interview questions are adequately linked to the CRQ. There may be too few or too many for the target time, too many questions may be quantitative, or questions may not be engaging.</td>
<td>Interview questions are clearly linked to the Central Research Question, are mostly qualitative, and exhibit innovation. The number of interview questions is appropriate for a 5-10 minute interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Writing is unclear or vague, and multiple components of the methods are missing.</td>
<td>Methods may be well-written but lack key information about the target group and/or points of comparison. Conversely, all points may be covered, but writing may be unclear.</td>
<td>Methods are clear and concise. They include the rationale for how/why the target group was selected; who the target group is, how members of the target group will be approached, and what points the team plans to compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>The research team's goals are unclear, and the language is inappropriate.</td>
<td>The research team's goals are somewhat clear. Language may be overly formal or overly casual.</td>
<td>The research team's goals and what they will be asking of the participant are clear. Language is professional, yet friendly and polite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions II*</td>
<td>Interview notes are sloppy or insufficient</td>
<td>Some interviewers took too few notes, were sloppy, or recorded tangential information</td>
<td>All Interviewers took careful notes that made for relatively easy data analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions II will be evaluated when you submit your binder for Assignment #3.
Assignment #3: Rough Draft (9-10 pages, 50 points)

Meet with your group to pool your data. Put the data into rough form and label this section **Results**. Take notes as you: 1) Discuss what you think the data means and what problems (if any) you had. This information will be your **Discussion** section. You can also talk about things like small sample size, whether or not your sample was representative, etc. 2) Discuss what basic conclusions can you draw regarding your research question and what kinds of research could be done to tell you more. This will be your **Conclusions** section.

Assign one research partner to organize the data as charts or other visuals. Assign three partners to each write up one of the 3 sections (one writes the results, one write the discussion, etc). The remaining partner should be in charge of revising the literature review (based on suggestions from the instructor), compiling, formatting and editing the full document, and will emailing the completed document to the instructor by the deadline in the syllabus.

In addition to the standard formatting instructions in the syllabus, put each student name in the upper left corner and the project title in the top middle of the first page.

Place a print copy of the rough draft in your 3-ring binder and submit the binder to your instructor.

Summary of duties: Team members assign duties
# Rubric for Assignment #3

Meeting threshold: You MUST format the document according to parameters in the syllabus, and your document MUST be in the page range required for the assignment. Failure to do so will result in me returning your assignment to you, and you re-submitting it when the error(s) have been fixed. You will also lose points for turning in a late assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-6)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (7-8)</th>
<th>Outstanding (9-10)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lit Review</strong></td>
<td>Links between the lit and CRQ are unclear or vague. Instructor feedback has not been incorporated sufficiently.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate understanding of the literature. A key term or a pertinent argument may have been overlooked, but CRQ is clearly linked to the lit and the section has been revised according to instructor feedback.</td>
<td>Demonstrates excellent understanding of the literature through application of relevant terms from the text, comparison of main arguments in the articles, and selection of a related CRQ. Has been revised according to instructor feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Methods are vague or unclear, and/or the section has not been revised sufficiently according to instructor feedback.</td>
<td>Most pertinent information about the methods is included, although a key point may have been overlooked. Has been revised according to instructor feedback.</td>
<td>Includes a summary of the types of questions asked; rationale for how/why the target group was selected; how members of the target population were located and approached; what preparations the team took to prepare for interviews (memo). Has been revised according to instructor feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is disorganized, does not represent what is in the interview notes, or is lacking altogether.</td>
<td>Relevant data is included, but presentation can be made clearer by revising graphics and/or sentence structure.</td>
<td>Relevant data is organized in a logical manner, including graphics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to explain what the data means, address methods issues, and/or ways to improve the research design.</td>
<td>Explanation of what the data comprises is clear, but analytic depth is lacking (no explanation of WHY the data exhibits certain trends, for example). May not address issues with methods, or does not include ways to improve the research design.</td>
<td>Discussion of data is clear, concise, and shows insight as to how/why the data set looks the way it does. Possible problems with methods and/or advice for future research teams/ways to improve the research design are discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of key points lacks detail, is not integrated, or is missing. Statements about Elon food culture are superficial and not linked to the literature or the research.</td>
<td>Summary of key points and statement about Elon food culture lacks detail or is listed rather than integrated. Revision may require that connections are more concrete and/or writing is clarified.</td>
<td>Summarizes the key points of the lit review, results, and discussion. Provides a clear explanation of food culture at Elon based on the literature and the research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment #4: Final Draft (8-10 pages, 50 points)

Read the feedback from your instructor. Read the rubric so that you understand what is expected of you in terms of revision and editing. If you are unsure, ask the instructor or visit the Writing Center.

Divide up the tasks for revision and assign one partner to serve as the editor for the final draft, ensuring that there are no mistakes in grammar, spelling, syntax, or diction. Proper formatting (listed in the syllabus) must also be followed. Email the final version of the Research Paper to the instructor by the due date in the syllabus.

Place a print copy of the final version in the front of the 3 ring binder. By this time, your binder should also include a blank interview sheet, the original interview sheets, the rough draft and rubrics/feedback, the notes for your literature review, and your notes from group meetings (in that order). To complete your binder, separate each of these sections with labeled dividers.

Email the final version of the Research Paper to the instructor by the deadline in the syllabus, and submit the binder by the same date.

*NOTE: if you do not adequately address the instructor comments on the rough draft in the final version, you will NOT earn full marks for the final draft.

Meeting Threshold: You must have everything on the checklist in your binder, and the final paper must be 9-10 pages and formatted according to the specifications in the syllabus. Failure to do so will result in me returning your assignment to you, and you re-submitting it when the error(s) have been fixed. You will also lose points for turning in a late assignment.

BINDER CHECKLIST:

1. Final paper (with list of sources cited in APA format)
2. Blank interview sheet (Appendix I)
3. Completed interview sheets (Appendix II)
4. Rough draft
5. Rubrics for assignments 1-3
6. Literature Review notes (one set per team member)
7. Group meeting notes (typed or hand written)
8. Labeled dividers for 1-7

Summary of duties: Team members assign duties
**Rubric for Assignment #4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0-6)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (7-8)</th>
<th>Outstanding (9-10)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Sections of the paper are missing necessary information. Sections may be disorganized or illogical. Information in some sections contradicts rather than supports information in other sections.</td>
<td>Each part of the paper includes the necessary information in a logical, organized fashion. However, there may be some unnecessary information or something may be lacking. Connections between sections may not be smooth.</td>
<td>Each part of the paper is linked to and supports what preceded it (cohesive). Connection of research to anthropological terms and themes is smooth and logical. Nothing is lacking, and there is no superfluous information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>There are so many obvious errors in spelling, grammar, diction, and syntax that they distract the reader from the point of the paper.</td>
<td>There are some errors in spelling, grammar, diction and/or syntax, but they do not occur often enough to distract the reader from the overall argument.</td>
<td>There are few, if any, errors in grammar or spelling. Diction (word choice) and syntax (sentence structure) are impeccable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Revision</strong></td>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the team revised the rough draft. Nothing has been moved, expanded, or trimmed. Changes to the draft are limited to improving mechanics.</td>
<td>There is some evidence that the team worked to revise when producing the final product. The arguments/data have been clarified, and unnecessary information has been eliminated or minimized. However, there are some places where more expansion/trimming would improve the</td>
<td>The finished product differs from the rough draft in 2 ways: 1) there is expansion/growth in terms of the quality of the ideas in the paper, and 2) superfluous information or words have been eliminated. The overall effect is that the data and the connections to anthropological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Product</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Concepts jump out at the reader (they are clarified and made stronger).</td>
<td>The paper reads well overall, although there are some places that confuse the reader or seem out of place. When the reader reaches the Conclusions, they may have some unanswered questions about the research, but generally found the paper engaging and interesting.</td>
<td>The paper reads like a polished, professional document. Each section is clearly marked and flows naturally. There are no places the reader finds unclear. Once the reader reaches the Conclusions, they feel satisfied that they have learned about food culture at Elon and what they read was engaging and interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorp. of Instructor Feedback</td>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the team incorporated the feedback from the instructor. Suggestions to develop content, shore up arguments, and/or address problems with terms are consistently ignored across drafts.</td>
<td>There is some evidence that the team worked to improve the clarity and quality of the paper based on the instructor's feedback, but some problems with content or clarity persist.</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the team worked to remedy places in the paper that the instructor gave feedback regarding development, trimming, revision, and editing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment #5: Oral Presentation (25-30 minutes, 50 points)**

Your oral presentation is a chance for you to present your research to the class. It should include a summary of the literature (including relevant terms from
the textbook), the CRQ and interview questions, methods, results, discussion, and conclusions. You can divide the responsibility for these parts as you wish, but EVERYONE must speak. Your grade for the presentation is completely determined by peer review (see below).

On the day of the oral presentation, I will also distribute a peer review sheet to be completed by each group member about the members of their own group. This includes a self-evaluation.

I reserve the right to adjust individual grades according to peer review. In other words, if it comes to my attention that a particular team member failed to share responsibilities equally with the other teammates, that teammate may earn a lower score than his/her teammates earn.

Peer Review

The oral presentation will be assessed by your classmates, who will sit with their own research teams and give evaluate you using the following form:
Peer Review Sheet for Audience Members

Presenting Group Members:

Group Topic/Team Number:

Day/Date: ______________________________

Course: ________________________________

Peer Reviewers/Team Number:

Answer the questions below in a sentence or two. Then give the presenting group a score between 0-5 for each one.

1. Did the group explain the literature they read clearly, and did they relate it to concepts in Haviland (including culture)?

2. Did the group introduce their research question and explain how they decided to focus on that question?

3. Did the group explain their methods and interview questions effectively?

4. Did the group summarize their data in a way that was clear to you?

5. Do the group’s interpretations of the data and their conclusions seem appropriate?

6. Did the group’s research teach you something new about food culture at Elon?

7. Were the visuals, the volume (sound level), and the diction of the speakers appropriate?

8. How satisfied are you with the flow of the presentation?
9. Did the group take the appropriate amount of time (25-30 minutes)?

10. Overall, how interesting was the presentation to you? What aspects did you like?

   List one person from the presenting research team who you feel deserves credit for an outstanding job:

   MVP: ____________________________________________

WRITE A DISCUSSION QUESTION:
Peer Review Sheet for Research Team Members

Team Number:____________________________

Peer Reviewer Name and Number:____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member Name</th>
<th>Completed Tasks on Time (0-3)</th>
<th>Completed Tasks Well (0-3)</th>
<th>Promoted Positive Group Morale (0-3)</th>
<th>Effort (0-1)</th>
<th>Total (0-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you think your group did particularly well?

Is there anything that you think your group could have done better?

Is there a contribution you made to the project that you are particularly proud of? (Something that was hard but turned out well, for example...)

Is there a part of the project that you would have liked to improve upon?

Is there an MVP in your group? If so, write his/her name here:__________________________

If there is anything you think Dr. Runestad should know about how the research team worked together, please write it below...