Department of
BACHELOR'S THESIS: EVALUATION

Student number

Student name

Area of specialization

Title of the thesis

	Assessment scale	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
I **Problem setting of the study**							
1. Explication of how the study relates to a phenomenon or area of interest		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Specification and limitation of the research problem and questions		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
II **Contribution and the use of scientific methods**							
3. Review of literature		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Develops a systematic and logical approach to the inquiry		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Develops conceptual synthesis		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Collects and uses empirical material/data (if applicable)		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Interprets and discusses results; draws conclusions		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
III **Presentation and integration of the study**							
8. Academic style, language use and readability		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Consistency and coherence of the thesis		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

Name of the examiner / advisor

Students dissatisfied with the grading of a study attainment may appeal against it either orally or in writing to the teacher in charge of the evaluation. The appeal against a grade of a study attainment shall be filed within 14 days of the date on which the student has been offered the opportunity to see the results and the evaluation criteria applied to their study attainment

Aalto University
School of Business

B.Sc. Thesis Rubric
I Problem setting of the study, attributes 1-2
II Contribution and the use of scientific methods, attributes 3-7
III Presentation and integration of the study, attributes 8-9

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 within the discipline	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 and limitation of the research problem and questions	Provides very vague description of the research problem and questions.	Provides limited specification of the research problem and questions.		Provides clear specification and limitation of the research problem and questions.		Provides an engaging specification and limitation of the research problem and questions.
3. Review of literature	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research problem and question. and/or fails to identify relevant literature.	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it clearly to the research problem and question.		Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research problem and questions.		Demonstrates critical thinking, creativity and insight in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research problem and questions.
4. Develops a systematic and logical approach to the inquiry	Provides a vague explanation of the approach to the inquiry; Fails to logically describe planned approach	Describes logically and clearly the research approach		Describes logically and clearly the research approach with a clear justification of the chosen approach above other approaches		In addition to the description for "Good": Explains how the chosen approach fits into existing paradigms of research methodologies and their limits
5. Develops conceptual synthesis	Fails to develop a conceptual structure	Identifies some appropriate concepts and explains what they mean		Clearly identifies appropriate concepts and explains what they mean in the context of the study; Demonstrates a conceptual structure		Develops and applies a clear and consistent conceptual structure through synthesis of other/new concepts or lenses
6. Collects and uses empirical material/data (if applicable)	Fails to clarify what material/data is used or how it is used; or uses inappropriate material/data; or exhibits inappropriate use of material/data	Identifies appropriate material/data and explains how it is used		Clearly identifies appropriate material/data and explains how it is used; Uses material/data is a way that is consistent with the logic of the inquiry and its purpose		In addition to the description for "Good": Identifies problematic issues and limits to the use of the material/data

7. Interprets and discusses results; draws conclusions	Provides unclear interpretations and conclusions, and/or provides conclusions that do not logically emerge from the research; Provides no discussion	Makes some interpretations and draws conclusions; Provides little discussion		Provides clear interpretations that emerge from analysis and draws logical conclusions; Identifies some limitations of the results	In addition to the description for "Good": Identifies and discusses problematic issues and limits; Where relevant, provides possible alternative interpretations or conclusions
8. Academic style, language use and readability	Uses non-academic style; inaccurate language use interferes with reading and comprehension; citation format not observed.	Uses language sufficiently accurately and appropriately for comprehension but use of illustrations and examples infrequent and/or not fully competent; citation format not always observed.		Uses appropriate academic language well; minor errors may exist but do not interfere with fluent 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.
9. 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.