

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

2024-2025 (Spring 2025)

*Assignment #2 Rubric*

Below is an overview of the criteria by which your **Preliminary Drafts** 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 research question, the articulation of the research problem, the engagement with appropriate literature, the methodological plan, and the overall structure and writing of your draft.

## **Content Requirements (*generally recommended*)**

The following three components will be assessed. We provide basic guidelines for what each section ought to include.

*\*\*Your supervisor may arrange for alternative requirements or provide additional support. Always consult with them if you have questions or concerns.\*\**

### **I. Introduction**

- Present a refined research question in clear terms and in accordance with the best practices reviewed in the seminar.
- Articulate the research problem and motivation clearly and persuasively, including the puzzle or gap the research addresses.
- Explain the proposed research plan and how it will answer the research question.

### **II. Literature Review Outline**

- Establishes where the research question fits within the existing literature.
- Engages and reviews relevant literature.
- Clarifies the literature review type (integrative, theoretical, methodological, etc.) and structures the review accordingly.
- [Optional] Outlines the review by sections/subsections.

### **III. Analytical Framework & Methodology (*or equivalent*)**

- Identifies and justifies data and sources (data types, sources, and collection methods).
- Describes case selection logic (*if applicable*) and provides a descriptive overview.
- Details the specific analytical method(s) to be used.
- Describe data collection and storage.

#### **Length and Format:**

- 3,000-3,500 words.
- Follow the Korean Studies style guide for formatting.

*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.