**Department of**

**BACHELOR'S THESIS: EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student number  |       |  |  |  |
| Student name |       |  |  |
| Area of specialization |       |  |  |
| Title of the thesis |       |  |  |
|  |  |  |

 **Assessment scale**

**0 2’1 k2 ’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

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

Examiner / Advisor

**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. |