**Department of**

**MASTER'S THESIS: EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student number  |       | Thesis carried out  | on assignment for | [ ]  |
| Student name |       | private sector | [ ]  |
| Program |       | public sector | [ ]  |
| Title of the thesis |       | research project | [ ]  |
|  | other:       | [ ]  |

 **Assessment scale**

**I Problem setting of the study**

 1. Explication of how the study relates to a phenomenon or area of interest 0 1 2 3 4 5

 2. Specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions 0 1 2 3 4 5

**II Contribution and the use of scientific methods**

 3. Positioning of the research problem, objectives and/or questions 0 1 2 3 4 5

 4. Review of literature 0 1 2 3 4 5

 5. Development of a theory-based framework, model and/or hypothesis 0 1 2 3 4 5

 6. Selection and justification of research methods 0 1 2 3 4 5

 7. Selection and justification of research material or data 0 1 2 3 4 5

 8. Application of research methods 0 1 2 3 4 5

 9. Analysis and presentation of data/findings 0 1 2 3 4 5

**III Presentation and integration of the study**

10. Discussion and interpretation of findings 0 1 2 3 4 5

11. Development of practical, societal, and/or theoretical implications

 and discussion of avenues for future studies 0 1 2 3 4 5

12. Knowledge of ethics in academic research 0 1 2 3 4 5

13. Academic style, language use and readability 0 1 2 3 4 5

14. Consistency and coherence of the thesis 0 1 2 3 4 5

Grading scale: 0 = failed, 1 = sufficient, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent

**Other factors contributing to the assessment**:

**Overall assessment:**

**Proposed grade** (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, satisfactory = 2, sufficient = 1)

Excellent: [ ]  5

Very good: [ ]  4

Good: [ ]  3

Satisfactory: [ ]  2

Sufficient: [ ]  1

Failed: [ ]  0

Date

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Examiner 1 Examiner 2

**M.Sc. Thesis Rubric**

**I Problem setting of the study, attributes 1-2**

**II Contribution and the use of scientific methods, attributes 3-10**

**III Presentation and integration of the study, attributes 11-14**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measurable Attributes** | **0 – Insufficient** | **1 – Sufficient** | **2** | **3 – Good** | **4** | **5 – Excellent** |
| 1. Explication of how the study relates to a phenomenon or area of interest | Provides a vague or no description of the relationship. | Provides some explication of the relationship. |  | Provides a clear explication of the relationship. |  | Explicates the relationship in an insightful manner. |
| 2. Specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions | Provides very vague or no description of the research problem, objectives and/or questions. | Provides limited specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions. |  | Provides clear specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions. |  | Provides an insightful specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions. |
| 3. Positioning of the research problem within the discipline | Does not position the research problem within the discipline. | Positions the research problem within the discipline to some extent. |  | Positions the research problem appropriately within the discipline. |  | Positions the research problem solidly within the discipline. |
| 4. Review of literature | Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research question and/or objective, possibly omitting key references. | Reports on earlier literature without connecting it fully to the research question and/or objective. |  | Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective in an appropriate manner. |  | Demonstrates critical thinking in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective. |
| 5. Development of a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses | Does not use a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses. | Applies a framework, model and/or hypotheses loosely based on theory. |  | Develops or applies a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses. |  | Develops an innovative theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses. |
| 6. Selection and justification of research methods | Selects inappropriate research methods, does not justify or link them to the research questions or objectives. | Selects appropriate research methods, but does not justify them clearly or create a linkage to the research questions or objectives. |  | Selects appropriate research methods that are justified and linked to the research questions or objectives. |  | Selects appropriate, sophisticated, and rigorous research methods that are clearly justified and linked to the research questions or objectives. |
| 7. Selection and justification of research material or data  | Selects inappropriate research material, does not justify it, or link it to the research questions and methods. | Selects applicable research material that is weakly justified and/or linked to the research questions and methods. |  | Selects appropriate research material that is justified and linked to the research questions and methods. |  | Selects rich research material that is fully justified and solidly linked to the research questions and methods. |
| 8. Application of research methods | Applies research methods in an inappropriate manner. | Applies research methods in a broadly appropriate manner, with some implementation weaknesses that affect the outcome. |  | Applies research methods in an appropriate manner. |  | Applies research methods with rigor and proficiency. |
| 9. Analysis and presentation of data/findings (including diagnostics) | Analyses and/or presents data/findings inadequately. | Provides mostly adequate analysis and presentation of the data/findings. |  | Provides clear and competent analysis and presentation of the data/findings. |  | Provides rigorous and convincing analysis and presentation of the data/findings. |
| 10. Discussion and interpretation of findings, including limitations | Fails to relate findings to existing literature; provides superficial or erroneous interpretations; provides limited or no discussion of the limitations.  | Discusses some connections between findings and existing literature on a general level; provides limited interpretations; addresses some limitations of the study. |  | Discusses findings and relates them appropriately to existing literature; provides appropriate interpretations; addresses the key limitations of the study.  |  | Discusses thoroughly and critically the findings in relation toexisting literature; provides perceptive interpretations; discusses the limitations appropriately. |
| 11. Development of practical, societal, and/or theoretical implications and discussion of avenues for future studies | Fails to develop implications of the study; fails to suggest avenues for future studies. | Develops some implications of the study; presents some avenues for future studies. |  | Develops clear implications of the study; presents avenues for future studies. |  | Develops insightful implications and avenues for future studies. |
| 12. Knowledge of ethics in academic research  | Fails to conduct research according to academic norms. | Shows awareness of ethical issues; may report on them. |  | Demonstrates knowledge of ethical issues; may discuss them explicitly. |  | Displays competence in addressing ethical issues in academic research; may provide suggestions of advanced or innovative solutions to ethical problems. |
| 13. Academic style, language use and readability | Uses non-academic style; inaccurate language use interferes with reading and comprehension; citation format not observed. | Uses sufficiently appropriate academic style; inaccurate language use does not interfere substantially with reading and comprehension; use of illustrations and examples infrequent and/or not fully competent; citation format not always observed. |  | Uses academic language fluently; minor errors may exist but do not interfere with reading and comprehension; illustrations and examples contribute to the clarity of the arguments; citation format almost always observed. |  | Produces a thesis that meets academic writing standards; readily conveys meaning; illustrations and examples enhance the clarity of the arguments; citation format consistently observed. |
| 14. Consistency and coherence of the thesis | Text is fragmented and unbalanced; internal links among theory, methods and results are not explicit; problems with headings and paragraph and section structure. | Text is not fully balanced; some key internal links are missing; does not fully form a coherent whole; some problems with headings and paragraph and section structure. |  | Forms a balanced and coherent whole; some internal linkages are implicit rather than explicit; headings and paragraph and section structure typically support the overall coherence. |  | Forms a coherent whole with consistent and explicit internal linkages; has a logical flow of argumentation with neat headings and clearly structured paragraphs and sections. |