Bachelor´s Thesis Grading Rubric

Bachelor´s Program in International Business, Mikkeli Campus

- The final grade for the Bachelor´s Thesis is calculated as a weighted average of grades for each measurable attribute.
- Grading scale for Bachelor´s Thesis: 5 (highest), 4, 3, 2, 1 (0 = fail). The grades 4 and 2 are not described in this rubric in detail, but they can be used like all other grades. A score of 0 in any of the attributes will result in a failing grade for the final thesis.
- Due to the varying importance of the measurable attributes, they have been assigned different weights (see the WEIGHT column) for use in the final grading.
- The BScBA Thesis Grading Sheet will be used by thesis supervisors for grading; it contains the formulas needed for calculating the weighted average and the final grade. The supervisors should also use the BScBA Thesis Grading Sheet during the process when advising students and when sending them the tentative grade.

Measurable Attributes	0 = insufficient	1	2	3	4	5	Weight
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	**1**
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	**2**
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	**3**
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	**1**
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	**2**
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	**2**

Measurable Attributes	0 = insufficient	1	2	3	4	5	Weight
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	**3**
8. Academic style, language use and readability	Uses nonacademic 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	**2**
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	**1**