

5723VKO1Y: BA-Eindwerkstuk Seminar

2024-2025 (Spring 2025)

Assignment #3 Rubric

Below is an overview of the criteria by which your **Empirical Draft** will be evaluated. This rubric is intended to guide your understanding of how instructors and supervisors will assess the key components of your work: the application of your research design, the quality and relevance of your data analysis, the clarity and significance of your preliminary findings, the integration with prior sections (literature review and methodology), and the overall structure and academic presentation of your draft.

Content Requirements

In this assignment, students are expected to submit a draft version of their empirical chapter. This chapter should apply the research design laid out in earlier assignments and present the initial stages of data analysis. The chapter must demonstrate how the data collected aligns with the stated research question and chosen methodology. Preliminary findings should be clearly presented, with an emphasis on how the evidence begins to address the research problem and contributes to filling the identified gap in the literature.

Importantly, the empirical chapter should be clearly and coherently linked to previous work. It must build upon the literature review and methodological framework developed in earlier drafts, showing a logical and meaningful connection between the research design and the emerging analysis. The goal is to illustrate that the empirical investigation is not only methodologically sound but also firmly grounded in the existing academic discourse relevant to the study.

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

Rubric below

Criterion	9–10	8–8.9	7–7.9	6–6.9	3–5.9	<2.9
Empirical Analysis	Sophisticated analysis that is aligned with the research question and shows insight into the data; compelling, well-supported analysis.	Strong and well-reasoned analysis; clear engagement with the data and research question.	Adequate analysis with some inconsistencies or gaps; interpretation generally aligns with the research question.	Basic attempt at analysis, but lacks clarity or depth; misalignments present.	Weak or confused interpretation and minimal connection between the analysis and the research question.	No meaningful analysis; findings are off-topic or incoherent.
Use of Evidence	Superb use of primary data; well-selected and presented excerpts, quotes, or figures; fully supports claims.	Appropriate evidence supports most points; generally effective in linking data to argument.	Some relevant evidence, but unevenly applied or inconsistently interpreted.	Evidence is used but not clearly linked to findings or not well contextualized.	Minimal or irrelevant evidence; unclear use of data.	No use of relevant primary sources.
Integration with Literature & Method	Excellent integration with prior sections; empirical chapter completes and builds on earlier design logically.	Good consistency with literature/methodology; most elements tied together well.	Some disjointed sections; basic coherence between empirical and earlier sections.	Gaps between empirical findings and prior work; poor transitions or inconsistencies.	Little to no effort to connect earlier work with findings.	Empirical section is disconnected or contradicts earlier design.
Structure & Clarity	Exceptionally clear organization, strong transitions and writing; applied academic style, tone, and language.	Well-structured with perhaps minor issues; writing is generally clear.	Acceptable structure and style; some unclear sections or transitions. Some typographical or grammatical issues.	Noticeable issues with structure or clarity; sections feel disjointed. Writing style needs work.	Poorly organized; unclear argumentation; fails to meet style guide.	Disorganized and unreadable; fails to meet formatting or structure requirements.