

Title Page that includes:
Title of the Research Portfolio
Your name and student number
Class name
My name
Date you submitted the portfolio

Comment [EM1]: This template isn't complete, but it should give you a clearer idea of what the final product can look like. I did this quickly, so please excuse any typos or sloppy writing.

Part 1: Introduction

Canada's economy has been consistently shaped by megaprojects; massive infrastructure installations that usually facilitate private or state forms of industrial development. However, while economics is central to these major moments of industrialization, they also have serious human implications. This is particularly the case in terms of race and ethnicity. This research portfolio explores this issue through lens of the Canadian Pacific Railway's employment of Chinese migrant workers during the late 1880s. *{Two or three more sentences that set up the topic: where it came from, what it sought to do, and the role of Chinese workers in that project. The goal here is to provide just enough information so that your question will make sense}* To explore these issues more thoroughly, this research proposal seeks to ask: what were the defining features of Chinese workers' experiences in railway construction, and what can the treatment of Chinese workers—both during and immediately after the CPR's construction—tell us about ideas of race and ethnicity in late 20th century Canada? Drawing on one primary source and four secondary sources, this proposal argues that... *{One or two sentences that go on to tell us what your argument is. Your introduction must have an argument and it must answer your research question}*.

Comment [EM2]: The portfolio has three sections: Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3. Label them to keep things organized.

Comment [EM3]: To avoid stepping into the topics that you might be working on, I wrote on an issue that is not directly relevant to the class.

Comment [EM4]: The intro begins with one or two sentences that ease us into the issues.

Comment [EM5]: This is a transition sentence that moves us from the general topic to the specific topic you are working on.

Comment [EM6]: Here, you clearly articulate your research question.

Comment [EM7]: By the end of this one page you must tell us what the topic is, what your question is, and what your answer to that question is in the form of a thesis-statement (a short summary of your argument written in persuasive and clear language). You have a full page to do this. Use the space you have.

Part 2: Evidence

Secondary Source #1: Timothy Stanley, "John A. Macdonald, "The Chinese" and Racist State Formation in Canada," *Journal of Critical Race Inquiry* 3, no. 1 (2017): 3-29.

Stanley's article explores how early Canadian politics were defined by explicit forms of white supremacy, a politics of exclusion that was rooted in ideas of inherent biological difference. In particular, politicians such as John A. Macdonald conceptualized Canada as an "Aryan" nation based on the dispossession and marginalization of both Indigenous and Chinese communities.¹ *{One more summary sentence on what the author says about this, then shift into some sort of analytical point that connects the source to your argument. You can't possibly summarize the entire article or book you are using. Just summarize the topic and main point that relates to your project.}*

Stanley's work is important because it demonstrates the contradictions through which Canada was both dependent on Chinese labour for project such as the CPR, yet also sought to limit the impact of Chinese migration on the long-term development of Canada. For example, ...

Comment [EM8]: I'm not going to provide an example for each piece of evidence. Instead, two examples will suffice to show you what this ought to look like. Remember, you'll need five pieces of relevant and acceptable evidence in total: one primary source and four secondary sources.

Comment [EM9]: Cite the source at the top in Chicago style as you would in a footnote. You'll also need to cite the source as you use it. Single space the entry at the top of the page to save space and then return to double-spacing for the body of the paragraph.

Comment [EM10]: You can use footnotes or endnotes. If this makes your pages over a single page, that's fine. In general, I don't mind if you write a little more than one page. Don't use footnote space towards filling up your page. That doesn't count.

Comment [EM11]: Your summary of the source should be just long enough to tell us what it is and how it's relevant to the topic. Make this no longer than 1/3 of a page. Use the rest of the page for proving your argument.

Comment [EM12]: After you have told us about the source, start a new paragraph that tells us how the source is useful for answering your question/supporting your argument. This is where you leverage your evidence to prove your point. Be clear and direct. Give examples based on the specific historical context. You may also want to comment on how a given source complements/supports/conflicts with your other sources in ways that are useful for answering your question.

¹ Citation in Chicago style. You need to cite both direct quotes and paraphrasing.

Primary Source #1: *Report of Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration: Report and Evidence* (Ottawa: Printed By Order of the Commission, 1885).

For my primary source, I've chosen to use the 1885 *Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration*. This Royal Commission was created to investigate the evidence for excluding Chinese immigration to Canada. {two more sentences on what's in the source/what it talks about/etc.}

The testimony provided to the *Royal Commission* is a clear indication that while opinions differed on the question of Chinese immigration, ideas of white superiority were clearly a prominent part of Canadian politics at the end of the 19th century. In this way, the *Report* elaborates on many issues raised by Stanley on the federal government's approach immigration in the wake of the railway's completion. For example, the *Report's* findings clearly support the argument that... {more sentences that clearly connect your reading of the source to the broader argument}

Comment [EM13]: Here, I'm going to follow my secondary source with my primary source. You don't have to follow this order. You could start with a primary source and then do all the secondary sources consecutively. Or you could do all the secondary sources first and end with the primary. It depends on how you're making your argument.

Comment [EM14]: The Royal Commission was an event that led to a published report. When referring to the published report, I italicize the name because it's a stand-alone publication like a book. When referring to the event there is no italicization. Remember, book titles are italicized and journal articles go in quotation marks.

Comment [EM15]: Here's an example of how you might build an argument by combining sources together.

Conclusion

The academic work of Stanley, {other secondary sources}, as well as the 1885 *Royal Commission* all demonstrate that... {argument that answers question}. Taken together these sources have been useful in supporting this argument because...

Comment [EM16]: Part 2: Evidence ends with a one page conclusion that lets you restate your argument. Use this as a space to remind your reader what your argument is by tying your sources together. You might also consider this a place to comment on why you think this is historically significant/important to know about.

Part 3: Bibliography

Secondary sources:

Stanley, Timothy. "John A. Macdonald, 'The Chinese' and Racist State Formation in Canada." *Journal of Critical Race Inquiry* 3, no. 1 (2017): 3-29.

{other source}

{other source}

{other source}

Primary source:

Report of Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration: Report and Evidence. Ottawa: Printed By Order of the Commission, 1885. Accessed via The Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 (8 March 2018): <https://www.pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/royal-commission-on-chinese-immigration-1885>.

Comment [EM17]: Part 3 includes a bibliography where you list your sources according to their type. Remember, the formatting and punctuation is different for bibliographies than it is for the footnotes/endnotes. Attention to detail matters.

Comment [EM18]: Within the subsection, sources are listed alphabetically based on author's last name.

Comment [EM19]: There's no listed author for this source, so it starts with the title. This is common for government reports. Because I've accessed this source online, I'm also going to list that information as well.