

Evaluation criteria for GSM Master's Thesis

Please highlight in any color of your choice the appropriate evaluation for each criterion.

| Criteria | A+ 90% > | A 80% - 89% | B 70% - 79% | C 60% - 69% | F – 59% < |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Introduction | Clearly and eloquently identifies a theoretical central argument. | Identifies theoretical central argument reasonably clearly. | Identifies theoretical central argument but not very clearly. | The central theoretical argument can be discerned with difficulties | Does not identify the central argument |
| Originality | Creative, intellectual sophistication, and leaps into new territory. | Expands rather than alters the thinking of a field | Re-uses someone else's idea but in a new context. | Applies someone else's idea in a usual way | Applies someone else's ideas, without any adaptation at all. |
| Research questions/ hypotheses | Defines in an original way and identifies new hypotheses/research questions | Defines clearly and identifies key hypotheses/research questions. | The definition is given but needs refinement of key hypotheses/research questions | The definition is incomplete and minimally worked out | Research questions and hypotheses are not clear at all |
| Conceptualization/ Model | Presents advanced theoretical conceptualization of the research | Applies an existing model to a new context | Re-uses the usual model for the research question | Model is minimally developed | Does not conceptualize the research issue or its context. |
| Survey of relevant literature | Excellent deep grasp of literature on the research question | Shows a good grasp of relevant literature and of their parts. | Shows average grasp of relevant literature and of their parts. | Shows poor grasp of relevant literature and of their parts. | Shows extremely poor grasp of relevant literature and of their parts. |
| Data | Presents original and accurate data or applies data in an innovative way. | Collected or uses data with effort; accurate but with exceptions | Reasonable data but not original and not always accurate | The data is cursory or weakly related to the research questions | Insufficient or highly inaccurate data |
| Data Analysis and results | Extremely well analyzed; quantitative data (if any) is statistically confirmed. | Reasonably well developed and persuasive and confirmed | Partially but not fully analyzed or tested | The analysis is minimal but sufficient | The analysis is insufficient or misleading |
| Provision of evidence and source materials | Facts and source materials are rich, detailed and appropriate. | Facts and source materials are appropriate but not very rich or detailed. | Facts and source materials are missing in many parts | Facts and source materials are missing in most parts. | There are no facts and source materials supporting the arguments |
| Sentence construction and grammar | All sentences are complete and grammatical. | All sentences are reasonably complete and grammatical. | Most sentences are complete and grammatical. | The large majority of sentences are ungrammatical and incomplete. | Almost all sentences are incomplete and ungrammatical |
| Citation of Sources | Sources of information and ideas are consistent and always correctly cited. | Sources of information and ideas are correctly cited with some exceptions | Sources of information and ideas are cited not consistently and correctly. | Citations of sources of information and ideas are missing in several places | Sources of information and ideas are not properly cited beyond reasonable omissions. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Overall structure | Overall structure as a whole is logical and quickly apparent. | The overall structure is reasonably logical and apparent. | The overall structure is logical but not always apparent | Overall structure and logic can only be discerned with effort | The overall structure is neither logical nor apparent |
| Conclusion | Draws original conclusions, points out shortcomings, identifies areas where further research is needed | Concludes main points reasonably well, identifies shortcomings and areas where further research is needed. | Summarizes but by and large repeats what has been presented in the text. | The conclusion is discernible only with an effort. | There is no conclusion. |
| Appropriate length and format for the subject matter (10,000 to 15,000 words) | Meets the requirements of minimal length and format | | | | Does not meet the requirements of minimal length and format |