Assignment 3: Stakeholder Analysis and Annotated Bibliography: Identifying Conversations

Overview: A first step before making a reasoned argument (Assignment 4) is to listen to the conversation. In our daily lives, issues are often framed for us as dichotomies, with two sides, a “right or wrong” or a “for or against.” A nuanced look at any issue, however, will reveal that there are as many sides as there are stakeholders involved. In academia, it is our responsibility to embrace an issue’s complexity before solidifying our opinions. One way to accomplish this is to create an inquiry question within the scope of a current debatable issue. These questions guide us as we research an issue and analyze the major stakeholders in the issue. In this assignment, you will choose an issue and an inquiry question within the course theme of the internet and social media. Your exploration will result in a synthesis of the major stakeholders in order to present a fuller and more accurate representation of the issue than a surface glance allows.

Purpose: To inform yourself, the class, and the instructor about an issue’s complexities, including the major stakeholders and potential arguments for the identified stakeholders.

Audience: After listening to the conversations of multiple stakeholders, you will inform your instructor and your classmates about four stakeholders in your issue.

Field Research/Interview: A major component of this analysis is to seek contact with actual stakeholders. You will contact at least one expert, or other important stakeholder, in order to gain a firsthand account of the expert's relationship to your issue and inquiry.

Annotated Bibliography: Before writing your stakeholder analysis (details below), you will create an annotated bibliography to document your research as you discover relevant stakeholders. An annotated bibliography is a list of citations to books, articles, and documents. Each citation is followed by an annotation—a brief, descriptive summary, as we learned in A1, and an evaluative statement. The purpose of the annotation is to inform yourself and the reader of the relevancy, accuracy, and quality of the sources cited. Note: you are not allowed to use articles previously read for the annotated bibliography.

Requirements:

Annotated Bibliography:

- provide six annotations, 150-200 words each—this will be done prior to the analysis itself.
- four of the six annotations must reflect different stakeholder positions.
- Two of the annotations must come from scholarly, academic sources
- One of the annotations must come from an interview/field research with an expert
- You may not use articles previously read in class

The Stakeholder Analysis:
Introduction: Include an interesting introduction which provides a hook for your audience, gives a clearly stated overview of the issue or problem you are considering (including your inquiry question that guided your research), provides background, including the necessary history and contextual information that your audience will need to understand your issue. You should also define unknown terms for your audience.

Stakeholder overview: Out of your annotated bibliography you will extract four stakeholders, bringing them together for analysis of their positions within the realm of your inquiry question, showing your audience how each stakeholder would answer your inquiry question.

Development: A thoughtful and thorough analysis of relevant stakeholders that makes clear the similarities and differences in their positions, including their relevant values, what is a stake for them and what they stand to lose or gain by the issue’s outcome.

Conclusion: Conclude your analysis by discussing potential arguments for each of the four stakeholders.

Coherence: Organize your analysis so that the paper is unified and focused. Use clear transitions to guide readers through your stakeholder analysis.

Analysis Details

- Format your analysis and document your sources according to MLA conventions.
- Avoid distracting spelling and grammar errors to improve credibility.
- Type your analysis in a readable, 12-point font and double-space it.
- Include a Works Cited Page

Calendar:

- Annotated Bibliography Workshop:
- Stakeholder Analysis Workshop:
- Annotated Bibliography and Stakeholder Analysis Due:

Paper Length:

Annotated Bibliography: Provide 6 citations, each about 150-200 words (totaling approximately 900-1200 words)

Stakeholder Analysis: 3-4 pages, double-spaced (approximately 900-1200 words)

Worth: 20% of your final course grade

**NOTE: At the end of your paper, include the following honor pledge: "I have not given, received, or used any unauthorized assistance."
### Grading Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Analysis: Development of Stakeholder Positions</strong></td>
<td>The analysis explores the similarities and differences in the stakeholders’ positions on the issue, noting what they value, what is at stake for them, and what they stand to lose or gain from the issue. The analysis also shows how each stakeholder group would answer the inquiry question and notes how and why groups answer the question in different ways. Rather than referring to stakeholder groups in general terms, the analysis cites specific evidence from research to back up the analysis.</td>
<td>The exploration of the stakeholders’ positions is incomplete, and may not explore the various stakeholder groups’ values, stakes in the issue, and what they stand to lose/gain. The analysis may not discuss the stakeholders’ answer to the inquiry question or the answers stated in the analysis are incomplete or not adequately developed. The analysis speaks about stakeholder groups in general terms and may not cite specific evidence, leading to concerns about plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Analysis: Issue introduction and Stakeholder Overview</strong></td>
<td>The analysis includes some background information about the issue, though it may need developed more to give the reader adequate context for understanding the issue and the inquiry. The analysis states the specific inquiry the student researched, though its connection to the larger issue could be clearer. The analysis identifies several stakeholder groups, though some of the groups may</td>
<td>The analysis provides little to no background information about the issue, or the background information that is present is thin. The reader may have trouble understanding the context of the inquiry. The analysis indicates that the student may not have a strong sense of the various stakeholder positions, since they are not well defined and may blend into each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Research:</td>
<td>Annotated Bibliography: Close and Critical Reading</td>
<td>AB: MLA Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholder/expert chosen to interview was relevant to your issue. The interview revealed a unique and developed conversation. The field research is developed to reflect conclusions rather than merely reporting the question asked and the answer given.</td>
<td>Though there may be some question about the reliability of some sources on the AB, for the most part research is reliable. The researcher may benefit from searching other databases and/or resources that are equally or more so reliable. The bib needs a better balance of informative and opinionated sources. Annotations may need more development of summary and/or evaluations in order to understand the reliability, relevance, usefulness to the project, etc.</td>
<td>Citation does not follow MLA style and/or citation errors are prevalent. The citation format for an AB is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholder/expert chosen to interview was relevant to your issue, however their relevancy could have been better developed in the analysis. Rather than developing ideas from the interview, the analysis seems to merely report what was said during the interview.</td>
<td>The AB does not represent key perspectives and/or is comprised of lower quality sources. The bib may have sources that are unreliable and/or have sources from only one database and/or only from the web. Annotations have weak summaries and/or do not provide support for source evaluations, OR summaries may be adequate but evaluations are thin or missing.</td>
<td>Minor citation errors are present. In general, the format for an AB is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholder/expert chosen to interview was not relevant to your issue. Or, field research is missing altogether.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
precisely. The correct format was used for the type of source being portrayed. The AB is correctly formatted: double-spaced, entries listed in alphabetical order, aligned left except the hanging indent after first line of citation, no extra spaces between entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Analysis and AB: Conventions and Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The language, tone, and voice of both the AB and the Stakeholder Analysis are those of a careful and critical reader, and the letter is edited for clear communication that is free of distracting errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the Stakeholder Analysis and AB could be more careful edited for style, they are generally clear and readable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of poor editing and/or style choices, the Stakeholder Analysis and AB are confusing or unclear for readers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

followed, but one requirement may be overlooked.

AB may have multiple format errors and/or does not follow format.