# M.Sc. Thesis Rubric

## I Problem setting of the study, attributes 1-2

### 1. Explication of how the study relates to a phenomenon or area of interest
- **0 – Insufficient**: Provides a vague or no description of the relationship.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Provides some explication of the relationship.
- **2**: Provides a clear explication of the relationship.
- **3 – Good**: Explicates the relationship in an insightful manner.

## II Contribution and the use of scientific methods, attributes 3-10

### 2. Specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions
- **0 – Insufficient**: Provides very vague or no description of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Provides limited specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.
- **2**: Provides clear specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.
- **3 – Good**: Provides an insightful specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.

### 3. Positioning of the research problem within the discipline
- **0 – Insufficient**: Does not position the research problem within the discipline.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Positions the research problem within the discipline to some extent.
- **2**: Positions the research problem appropriately within the discipline.
- **3 – Good**: Positions the research problem solidly within the discipline.

### 4. Review of literature
- **0 – Insufficient**: Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research question and/or objective, possibly omitting key references.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Reports on earlier literature without connecting it fully to the research question and/or objective.
- **2**: Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective in an appropriate manner.
- **3 – Good**: Demonstrates critical thinking in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective.

### 5. Development of a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses
- **0 – Insufficient**: Does not use a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Applies a framework, model and/or hypotheses loosely based on theory.
- **2**: Develops or applies a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.
- **3 – Good**: Develops an innovative theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.

### 6. Selection and justification of research methods
- **0 – Insufficient**: Selects inappropriate research methods, does not justify or link them to the research questions or objectives.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Selects appropriate research methods, but does not justify them clearly or create a linkage to the research questions or objectives.
- **2**: Selects appropriate research methods that are justified and linked to the research questions or objectives.
- **3 – Good**: Selects appropriate, sophisticated, and rigorous research methods that are clearly justified and linked to the research questions or objectives.

### 7. Selection and justification of research material or data
- **0 – Insufficient**: Selects inappropriate research material, does not justify it, or link it to the research questions and methods.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Selects applicable research material that is weakly justified and/or linked to the research questions and methods.
- **2**: Selects appropriate research material that is justified and linked to the research questions and methods.
- **3 – Good**: Selects rich research material that is fully justified and solidly linked to the research questions and methods.

### 8. Application of research methods
- **0 – Insufficient**: Applies research methods in an inappropriate manner.
- **1 – Sufficient**: Applies research methods in a broadly appropriate manner, with some implementation weaknesses that affect the outcome.
- **2**: Applies research methods in an appropriate manner.
- **3 – Good**: Applies research methods with rigor and proficiency.

## III Presentation and integration of the study, attributes 11-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Attributes</th>
<th>0 – Insufficient</th>
<th>1 – Sufficient</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 – Good</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 – Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explication of how the study relates to a phenomenon or area of interest</td>
<td>Provides a vague or no description of the relationship.</td>
<td>Provides some explication of the relationship.</td>
<td>Provides a clear explication of the relationship.</td>
<td>Explicates the relationship in an insightful manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions</td>
<td>Provides very vague or no description of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.</td>
<td>Provides limited specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.</td>
<td>Provides clear specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.</td>
<td>Provides an insightful specification of the research problem, objectives and/or questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positioning of the research problem within the discipline</td>
<td>Does not position the research problem within the discipline.</td>
<td>Positions the research problem within the discipline to some extent.</td>
<td>Positions the research problem appropriately within the discipline.</td>
<td>Positions the research problem solidly within the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review of literature</td>
<td>Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research question and/or objective, possibly omitting key references.</td>
<td>Reports on earlier literature without connecting it fully to the research question and/or objective.</td>
<td>Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective in an appropriate manner.</td>
<td>Demonstrates critical thinking in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research question and/or objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development of a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses</td>
<td>Does not use a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.</td>
<td>Applies a framework, model and/or hypotheses loosely based on theory.</td>
<td>Develops or applies a theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.</td>
<td>Develops an innovative theory-based research framework, model and/or hypotheses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Selection and justification of research methods</td>
<td>Selects inappropriate research methods, does not justify or link them to the research questions or objectives.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate research methods, but does not justify them clearly or create a linkage to the research questions or objectives.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate research methods that are justified and linked to the research questions or objectives.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate, sophisticated, and rigorous research methods that are clearly justified and linked to the research questions or objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Selection and justification of research material or data</td>
<td>Selects inappropriate research material, does not justify it, or link it to the research questions and methods.</td>
<td>Selects applicable research material that is weakly justified and/or linked to the research questions and methods.</td>
<td>Selects appropriate research material that is justified and linked to the research questions and methods.</td>
<td>Selects rich research material that is fully justified and solidly linked to the research questions and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Application of research methods</td>
<td>Applies research methods in an inappropriate manner.</td>
<td>Applies research methods in a broadly appropriate manner, with some implementation weaknesses that affect the outcome.</td>
<td>Applies research methods in an appropriate manner.</td>
<td>Applies research methods with rigor and proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Analysis and presentation of data/findings (including diagnostics)</td>
<td>Analyses and/or presents data/findings inadequately.</td>
<td>Provides mostly adequate analysis and presentation of the data/findings.</td>
<td>Provides clear and competent analysis and presentation of the data/findings.</td>
<td>Provides rigorous and convincing analysis and presentation of the data/findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discussion and interpretation of findings, including limitations</td>
<td>Fails to relate findings to existing literature; provides superficial or erroneous interpretations; provides limited or no discussion of the limitations.</td>
<td>Discusses some connections between findings and existing literature on a general level; provides limited interpretations; addresses some limitations of the study.</td>
<td>Discusses findings and relates them appropriately to existing literature; provides appropriate interpretations; addresses the key limitations of the study.</td>
<td>Discusses thoroughly and critically the findings in relation to existing literature; provides perceptive interpretations; discusses the limitations appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Development of practical, societal, and/or theoretical implications and discussion of avenues for future studies</td>
<td>Fails to develop implications of the study; fails to suggest avenues for future studies.</td>
<td>Develops some implications of the study; presents some avenues for future studies.</td>
<td>Develops clear implications of the study; presents avenues for future studies.</td>
<td>Develops insightful implications and avenues for future studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Knowledge of ethics in academic research</td>
<td>Fails to conduct research according to academic norms.</td>
<td>Shows awareness of ethical issues; may report on them.</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of ethical issues; may discuss them explicitly.</td>
<td>Displays competence in addressing ethical issues in academic research; may provide suggestions of advanced or innovative solutions to ethical problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Academic style, language use and readability</td>
<td>Uses non-academic style; inaccurate language use interferes with reading and comprehension; citation format not observed.</td>
<td>Uses sufficiently appropriate academic style; inaccurate language use does not interfere substantially with reading and comprehension; use of illustrations and examples infrequent and/or not fully competent; citation format not always observed.</td>
<td>Uses academic language fluently; minor errors may exist but do not interfere with reading and comprehension; illustrations and examples contribute to the clarity of the arguments; citation format almost always observed.</td>
<td>Produces a thesis that meets academic writing standards; readily conveys meaning; illustrations and examples enhance the clarity of the arguments; citation format consistently observed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Consistency and coherence of the thesis</td>
<td>Text is fragmented and unbalanced; internal links among theory, methods and results are not explicit; problems with headings and paragraph and section structure.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>