

# **5723VKO1Y: BA-Eindwerkstuk Seminar**

2024-2025 (Spring 2025)

*Assignment #1 Rubric*

Below is an overview of the criteria by which your **Revised Research Proposal** will be evaluated. This rubric serves as a guide to help you understand how the instructors will assess key components of your work: the clarity of your revised research question, the articulation of the research problem, the engagement with appropriate literature, the preliminary methodological plan, and the overall structure of your proposal.

Although the supervisor will assess later assignments, the instructors will use these guidelines to provide transparent feedback on your progress at this early stage, enabling you to refine and strengthen your research moving into the subsequent tasks.

The grade will be the average of the five components, all assigned a mark between one and 10:

1. *Research question:* Refined research question that is precise, feasible, and aligned with feedback from earlier weeks.
2. *Research problem:* Articulation of why addressing this gap matters for scholarly pursuit and Korean Studies.
3. *Literature:* Connect your research problem to the relevant academic literature relevant to your question
4. *Methodology:* Outline your data collection and analysis approach, specifying the types of data you plan to use, and any relevant methodological considerations introduced during the first four weeks.
5. *Structure:* Present the components in a clear and logical order, resembling the early stages of an academic research manuscript. The document follows the KS Style Guide.

*Rubric below*

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>9–10</b>	<b>8–8.9</b>	<b>7–7.9</b>	<b>6–6.9</b>	<b>3–5.9</b>	<b>&lt;2.9</b>
<b>Question</b>	Exceptionally clear, precise, and jargon-free; not leading or loaded; well-targeted to Korean Studies.	Clearly stated and well-defined, with most of the elements that make a good question.	Generally clear with some minor refinement needed.	Broadly stated or moderately refined, but still needs considerable work.	Vague or incomplete; minimal evidence of time spent developing.	Absent, off-topic, or otherwise unworkable.
<b>Problem</b>	Identifies a significant research problem that is highly motivated; provides a strong rationale and advanced relevance to Korean Studies.	Well-argued gap or problem; shows clear relevance to Korean Studies with good justification.	Recognizes a gap and some motivation for research; some details underdeveloped.	Some attempt to motivate question identified, minimal depth of explanation.	Superficial or unclear motivation; rationale poorly linked to Korean Studies.	Fails to identify any real gap or relevance; off-topic.
<b>Literature</b>	Demonstrates an excellent grasp of appropriate literature and shows understanding of purpose of the literature review, showing how the question and motivation aligns with existing scholarship.	Engages literature that is appropriate to the question and motivation, with some promising sources referenced. Basically clear how the literature review will be used.	Adequate references, moderately good integration with a literature that is potentially useful. Some evidence that there is a purpose to the literature review.	Limited or basic engagement with a literature. Not yet clear whether it is appropriate or how it will be used.	References are few, irrelevant, or poorly integrated; minimal connection to the question or motivation.	No meaningful engagement with academic literature or entirely off-topic.
<b>Methodology</b>	An exceptionally developed plan; demonstrates a high level of alignment with the research question and reflects advanced conceptual development.	Coherent approach with appropriate methods; mostly feasible; tied to the research question.	Sound plan overall but missing some specifics (e.g., sampling, feasibility, or data details).	Basic outline, lacks detail or clarity on feasibility and data usage.	Poorly structured or unjustified methods; unclear link to the research question.	No viable methodological plan or entirely unsuitable approach.
<b>Structure</b>	Excellent organization and flow; fully adheres to required style, word count, and layout guidelines.	Well-structured proposal; logically ordered sections, with only minor lapses.	Generally coherent format; some small issues in transitions or organization.	Adequate structure overall, though noticeably weak in coherence or organization.	Significant structural problems; inconsistent adherence to format or length.	Disorganized or missing essential sections; does not meet guidelines at all.