

Rating scales for the evaluation MA theses

This is the revised official rating form for OTAK theses. You are asked to make the following steps in the rating of the thesis assigned to you:

1. Fill in the student's name and your own, marking your role on this page below.
2. Having read the thesis you have been assigned, please **mark** it by awarding one score 0-4 for each scale, filling in the boxes as you go.
3. Finally, go to the end of this document, to award a grade.

The name of the student: _____

Your name as reader/supervisor (underline as appropriate): _____

*Step 1. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Research method and procedures** according to the descriptors below.*

Research method and procedures	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytical framework • Focus • (Quality of research design)
4	Research design is fully coherent and complete.
3	Research design is generally coherent and complete. The research methods are appropriate and consistently applied, but not justified or explicitly stated.
2	The reader perceives a clear focus. The research design is essentially coherent and complete, but there are lapses in explicit formulations and application of principles (incl. appropriacy of data collection). Research methods are not justified.
1	Research design is generally not adequately justified by the author or it is not clearly stated. Relevant aspects of research can only be inferred from the text. The reader can identify the focus.
0	Research design is not justified or clearly stated. There is no proper question; if there is, the design is not appropriate. The thesis lacks a clear focus.
Score awarded for the category of Research method and procedures :	

*Step 2. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Formal requirements** according to the descriptors below.*

Formal requirements	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout • Citation conventions
4	All formal requirements are consistently and thoroughly followed.
3	All formal requirements are generally (but not thoroughly) met. Nevertheless, the thesis demonstrates a good standard of formal requirements, including citation conventions (APA), layout and length.
2	Most formal requirements are met. Some problems appear in citation conventions (APA), and/or layout (e.g., paragraphing) and/or length.
1	Many formal requirements are <i>not</i> met. The thesis only demonstrates the minimum of formal requirements to the extent that comprehension is assured.
0	Formal requirements are not met at all. A likely case of plagiarism.*
Score awarded for the category of Formal requirements :	

**If there is a case of plagiarism, the thesis will be failed.*

Rating scales for the evaluation MA theses

Step 3. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Interpretation of findings** according to the descriptors below.

Interpretation of findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • Implications • (Enhanced awareness of professional development) 	
4	Findings are linked to the research question(s) and are presented without overgeneralizations. The results of the study are explicitly linked to the research questions/hypotheses presented in the beginning of the study. They are linked to those of previous research by others. Relevant pedagogical implications are elaborated. Clear evidence of an enhanced awareness of the field/subject. Explanations are convincing.
3	Findings are linked to the research question(s) and are presented without overgeneralizations. The results are not explicitly linked to the research questions/hypotheses. The results are linked to those of previous research by others. Plausible explanations. Evidence of some awareness of the field/subject.
2	Findings are rather implicitly linked to the research question(s)/hypotheses. They are not linked to those of previous research by others. There is an attempt to explain the results of the study. Explanations may not be plausible. Possible presence of overgeneralizations. Relevant pedagogical implications are elaborated on.
1	Findings are not linked to the research questions/hypotheses, the findings are not linked to those of previous studies, and/or results are mainly overgeneralizations. Pedagogical implications are superficial.
0	The thesis does not provide an interpretation of the findings. It is a mere description of the data. The results are not linked to those of previous studies, and no pedagogical implications are discussed.
Score awarded for the category of Interpretation of findings :	
<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	

Rating scales for the evaluation MA theses

Step 4. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Theoretical and experiential basis** according to the descriptors below.

Theoretical and experiential basis	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and number of sources • Familiarity with the literature • Synthesis of knowledge and skills
4	There is an excellent synthesis of the relevant literature (drawing on the thesis writer's knowledge, professional experience, and skills), appropriate in length. There is clear evidence of the writer's critical judgement, explicitly and appropriately formulated.
3	There is a good synthesis of the relevant literature (drawing on the thesis writer's knowledge, professional experience, and skills), appropriate in length or somewhat longer than necessary. An honest, faithful description of the literature (well-selected, representative sources), albeit a little dense. There is some evidence of the writer's critical judgement.
2	Although the writer familiarised himself/herself with the literature, the synthesis is poor: it is inconsistent, or partial (unsatisfactory, non-representative sources) or otherwise unconvincing. No evidence of critical judgement.
1	There is a literature review of an adequate number of sources, but there is little or no synthesis. The writer only verbalizes the literature. The thesis writer has not adequately familiarised himself/ herself with the literature.
0	Unaccountable/untraceable sources or too few sources selected. The relevant literature is not reviewed.
Score awarded for the category of Theoretical and experiential basis :	

Step 5. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Quality of English language use** according to the descriptors below.

Quality of English language use	
4	A high degree of accuracy, appropriacy, and the academic style of the thesis allow for a smooth and fluent reading.
3	Infrequent lapses in accuracy and/or appropriacy and/or academic style do not impede fluent reading.
2	Frequent lapses in accuracy and/or appropriacy and/or academic style result in lapses in fluency.
1	The quality of language does not allow for smooth and fluent reading. Reader struggles to appreciate professional content.
0	The thesis does not meet minimum requirements in terms of accuracy, appropriacy or academic style. Unreadable.
Score awarded for the category of Quality of English language use :	

Rating scales for the evaluation MA theses

*Step 6: Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Quality of writing** according to the descriptors below.*

Quality of writing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argumentation (in the whole of the text) • Structure of writing 	
4	The argumentation follows the academic standards of the field, sufficiently, convincingly, logically, and in a relevant way. It has some palpable persuasive power. It is well-structured, cohesive and coherent, reader friendly throughout.
3	The argumentation is somewhat idiosyncratic, but it is still convincing. The thesis is generally well-structured, coherent and reader friendly.
2	There is some clear argumentation, but there are flaws in it: The argumentation is debatable. The thesis is adequately (but not very well) structured.
1	The thesis is not adequately structured. Although the writer does take a stand, the argumentation is not convincing. The ideas are connected but the argument fails to convince. There are unsubstantiated claims. The writer manages to establish coherence, but it is not without problems.
0	Argumentation is absent, or it is completely unconvincing. There is only description. The thesis does little more than verbalise the results. The reader struggles with an obvious lack of coherence.
Score awarded for the category of Quality of writing :	

*Step 7. Please award the thesis you have read a score in the category of **Independence** according to the descriptors below.*

Independence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to the field • Originality 	
4	Besides independence, the thesis displays some original elements, however small in scope, which may be considered an original contribution to the field.
3	A good piece of independent work, although there is no originality in the thesis.
2	There is evidence of hard and conscientious work, but little independence is demonstrated.
1	The thesis demonstrates some elements of independence, as a bare minimum. There is heavy reliance on ideas by others.
0	The thesis demonstrates an overall reliance on others' ideas and work (albeit falling short of plagiarism). Superficial copying, "regurgitation" of ideas by others, without much insight. Lack of imagination.
Score awarded for the category of Independence :	

Final steps on next page:

Rating scales for the evaluation MA theses

When you have awarded all the scores, recommend an overall grade using the following bands:

5= 25-28

4= 18-24 points

3= 11-17 points

2= 7-10 points

1= 6 or below.

The logic for the delimitation of these bands was as follows: If you have a, say, very good thesis, for you which awarded at least a score of 4 points for the majority of the scales, i.e. at least 4 out of the 7 criteria (4 times 4 points = 16), the expectation is that for the remaining 3 criteria you have awarded 3 points (3 times 3 points = 9), coming to 25. The other band limits were decided following the same abstract principle of the majority of scores.

Your overall grade (1-5): _____ on the basis of (___/28) points.

