

Master's Thesis Assessment Criteria

Assessment Category	Criterion	Maximum grade
Quality of research		35
	Objectives	10
	Use of bibliography	10
	Research method(s)	15
Contribution		25
	Results	15
	Conclusions	10
Publications / publication potential		10
Quality of writing		20
	Structure	5
	Quality of tables and figures	5
	Writing style, layout and references to sources	5
	References to sources (Bibliography)	5
Defence		10
Total		100

Marking Guidelines

Criterion/Grade	5	4	3	2	1	0
Objectives	Originality, Innovative objectives, clearly defined, placed within the appropriate conceptual framework, scientifically substantiated	Originality, defined objectives, placed within the appropriate conceptual framework, scientifically substantiated	Adequately original, adequately defined objectives, most of which are scientifically substantiated.	Defined objectives, some of which are scientifically substantiated, but not innovative/original.	Defined objectives but inadequately placed within the appropriate conceptual framework, insufficiently substantiated from a scientific viewpoint and not	Objectives inadequately defined and placed within the appropriate conceptual framework, insufficiently substantiated from a scientific viewpoint and not

					at all innovative/original.	at all innovative/original.
Use of bibliography	Excellent knowledge, coverage, analysis, interpretation and application of the relevant bibliography.	Sufficient knowledge, coverage, analysis, interpretation and application of the relevant bibliography.	Adequate knowledge, coverage, analysis, interpretation and application of the relevant bibliography.	Adequate knowledge and coverage of the relevant bibliography, but insufficient analysis, interpretation and application.	Mere review of the relevant bibliography and limited interpretation and application.	Inadequate knowledge, coverage, analysis, interpretation and application of the relevant bibliography and use of irrelevant bibliography.
Research methodology	Excellent understanding and application of both the research methodology relevant to the subject and related research techniques.	Sufficient understanding and application of both the research methodology relevant to the subject and related research techniques.	Efficient application of both the research methodology relevant to the subject and related research techniques.	Good application of both the research methodology relevant to the subject and related research techniques.	Adequate application of both the research methodology relevant to the subject and related research techniques.	Lack of research methodology.
Research results	Highly original results. High level of understanding and analysis (theoretical or empirical) of the research results. In-depth	Highly original results. High level of understanding and analysis (theoretical or empirical) of the research	Adequately original results. High level of understanding and analysis (theoretical or empirical) of	Level of analysis (theoretical or empirical) of the research results adequate to draw conclusions, but no originality in the results. The	Level of analysis (theoretical or empirical) of the research results adequate to draw conclusions, but no originality in the results. The	Level of analysis (theoretical or empirical) of the research results inadequate to draw conclusions. The research results do not

	<p>knowledge of the scientific field. The research results contribute significantly to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>	<p>results. Knowledge of the scientific field. The research results contribute significantly to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>	<p>the research results. Limited knowledge of the scientific field. The research results contribute to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>	<p>research results contribute to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>	<p>research results have a minimum contribution to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>	<p>contribute to expanding knowledge in the scientific area/field.</p>
<p>Conclusions</p>	<p>The conclusions are logical and valid and demonstrate a very good knowledge of the relevant bibliography. They are clearly stated and have been assessed against existing knowledge in the field. The dissertation summary clearly states the purpose and findings of the study/research in easily understood terms.</p>	<p>The conclusions are logical and valid and demonstrate a good knowledge of the relevant bibliography. They are clearly stated and have been assessed against existing knowledge in the field. The dissertation summary clearly states the purpose and findings of</p>	<p>The conclusions are logical and valid. They are clearly stated and have been assessed against existing knowledge in the field. The dissertation summary clearly states the purpose and findings of the study/research.</p>	<p>The conclusions are partly logical and/or valid. They are clearly stated. The dissertation summary only partly states the purpose and findings of the study/research.</p>	<p>There are conclusions which are not logical and/or valid. They are not very clearly stated. The dissertation summary does not state the purpose and findings of the study/research.</p>	<p>There are no logical and/or valid conclusions. The dissertation summary does not state the purpose and findings of the study/research and incorrect terminology is being used.</p>

		the study/research.				
Publications / publication potential	One or more papers published or accepted for publication in a high impact/prestigious scientific journal.	At least one paper or abstract in peer-reviewed conference proceedings and one paper accepted for publication or submitted to a scientific journal.	At least one paper or abstract in peer-reviewed conference proceedings and potential for publication of one paper in a journal.	No submission. Potential for publication of one paper or abstract in peer-reviewed conference proceedings.	No submission. Publication of one paper or abstract in non peer-reviewed conference proceedings.	No submission. No publication potential.
Structure	Excellent structure, systematically organised, with excellent consistency in terms of argumentation, organisation and style. The chapters form a comprehensive and coherent whole.	Good structure, systematically organised, with consistency in terms of argumentation, organisation and style. The chapters form a comprehensive and coherent whole.	There is logical cohesion between objectives and results. Good chapter structure.	There is a partly logical cohesion between objectives and results. Adequate chapter structure.	There is organisation and structure, but inadequate logical cohesion between chapters.	Almost inexistent logical cohesion and relation between objectives and results. Inadequate organisation requiring substantial restructuring.
Quality of tables and figures	Very high quality, which contributes to the formulation	High quality, which contributes to	Adequate quality, which contributes to	Low quality, which creates confusion,	Low quality not contributing to the formulation of	Unacceptable quality leading to unacceptable

	of original research results. Compliance with all relevant standards.	the formulation of original research results. Compliance with all relevant standards.	the formulation of original research results. Compliance with most relevant standards.	contributing to the formulation of non-substantiated research results. Only partial compliance with the relevant standards.	research results. Very limited compliance with the relevant standards.	formulation of research results. No compliance with the relevant standards.
Writing style, layout and references to sources	The writing style and layout of the paper are of very high quality. There are no, or minimal, language and spelling mistakes and almost no correction is needed.	The writing style and layout of the paper are of high quality. There are few language and spelling mistakes and only a few corrections are needed.	The writing style and layout of the paper are satisfactory. There are language and spelling mistakes and several corrections are needed.	The writing style and layout of the paper require improvement. There are language and spelling mistakes and corrections are required.	The writing style and layout of the paper require substantial improvement. There are many language and spelling mistakes and extensive corrections are required.	The writing style and layout of the paper are seriously flawed and require major revisions. There are many serious, noticeable and unacceptable language and spelling mistakes.
References to sources	Extensive and properly made references and citations to bibliographical sources. The format and layout of the bibliography are correct and in line with internationally accepted systems.	References to bibliographical sources have been properly made. The layout of the bibliography is largely in line with internationally accepted systems. Bibliography includes the	References to bibliographical sources have been properly made. The layout of the bibliography is largely in line with internationally accepted systems. However, there are also	References to bibliographical sources have been made, but the layout of the bibliography is neither consistent nor in line with internationally accepted systems. Some major sources and sources of great relevance to	Neither the layout nor the format of the bibliography is in line with internationally accepted systems. Several major sources and sources of great relevance to the subject are missing.	References are of low quality or missing. Neither the layout nor the format of the bibliography is in line with internationally accepted standards. The bibliography does not include the major and most recent sources.

	Bibliography includes the most important and most recent sources.	most important sources.	deviations. Bibliography includes most of the major sources.	the subject are missing.		
Defence	Well-organised defence of professional standard. All questions were answered in a manner that demonstrates in-depth knowledge of the subject. Excellent slides.	Defence of professional standard. Almost all questions were answered in a manner that demonstrates very good knowledge of the subject. Well designed slides.	Defence of a good standard. Most questions were answered. Satisfactory slides.	Inadequately organised defence, wordiness over non-essential issues. Difficulty answering questions. Difficulty reading certain slides, errors in slides.	Incohesive and badly organised defence. Inability to answer several questions. Slides of very low quality.	No defence.