

Evaluation Master Thesis U.S.E. Part 2

Name of Student

Student number

Title of Thesis

| Evaluation criteria | | Performance/Comments | Maximum points |
|--|---|---|---------------------|
| | | Indicate if the performance is poor, moderate, sufficient, good or excellent, and explain why | Research /Thesis |
| 1 | <p>The student describes/motivates societal relevance of the main research question (societal relevance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on an appropriate demarcation, contextualization and accountability of the topic, a clear and relevant aim is formulated Unambiguous research questions with some subquestions that logically arise Consistency of aim and question If performance deviates from Research Proposal, explain why | | (10) |
| 2 | <p>The student describes the contribution to the existing literature (scientific relevance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature is made applicable to own research and extent and relevance of studied literature is appropriate Independent critical and in-depth review of literature Contribution to the literature clearly specified If performance deviates from Research Proposal, explain why | | (10) |
| 3 | <p>The student motivates and explains the research approach (methodology)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research approach is appropriate for research question; accountability of data collection and analysis, systematic operationalization of research question. Validity and reliability of study If performance deviates from Research Proposal, explain why | | (10) |
| 4 | <p>The student applies the research approach in an appropriate and correct way (approach).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate quantitative or qualitative analysis is conducted Quantitative or qualitative analysis is conducted correctly Adequate hypothesis testing or derivation of propositions Presentation of results: complete, to the point, adequately | | (25) |
| 5 | <p>The student interprets research findings in the light of societal and scientific relevance (interpretation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer to the questions is based on literature and empirical / theoretical research. Confrontation and intelligent combination of theoretical insights and empirical data. Reflection on results in the form of practical significance / (policy) recommendations. Critical evaluation of own research approach. | | (25) |
| 6 | <p>The student presents his/her research in an appropriate and structured way (presentation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and functional structuring of thesis, appealing layout, grammatically correct and in a decent language, good performance/participation in meetings. Accountability of sources and quotes | | (10) |
| 7 | <p>The student conducted the research in an independent and self-responsible way (process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence of execution Dealing with feedback | | (10) |
| 8 | <p>Other (bonus / malus)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research excels/disappoints in an aspect not covered by the above criteria. | | (max +/- 10 points) |
| <p>Grade 'B' for Research/Thesis = Total points (out of 100), divided by 10 (this grade will count for 90% in the final grade for the thesis (remaining 10% is based on research proposal)</p> | | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---------------|
| Remarks if after consultation 2nd supervisor differs twenty points or more: | | |
| A digital copy of the thesis is send to: BAMAtesis.USE@uu.nl | | Yes/no |
| Thesis has been checked for plagiarism (Ephorus) | | % |
| Name of 1st supervisor | Name of 2nd supervisor | |
| Signature of supervisor | Signature of supervisor | |
| Date | Date | |
| Remarks (In case the <i>thesis is not sufficient</i> , please note here whether or not it is eligible for an improvement trajectory, and which improvements need to be minimally made. In case the <i>percentage for plagiarism</i> is higher than the norm, please justify here.) | | |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Societal relevance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the research question based on a problem definition that demonstrates insight in the societal debate? |
| Scientific relevance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the research question based on a problem definition that demonstrates insight in the central debates and methods in the economics domain? To what extent does the thesis contain a critical report of the existing scientific debates? Does the review of academic literature contain (recent) publications meant for an academically educated audience? Is the research question authentic? |
| Methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are key concepts and theory used of courses from the master? Are the key concepts and theories understood correctly? If new key concepts, theories or methods will be applied, are they clearly and transparently explained? Have reliable sources been used? If the research is quantitative, is the data description clear and traceable? In the event of data collection, are the methods clearly described? If the research is qualitative, is the research valid and reliable? If the research is theoretical, is the relationship with existing literature clear and comprehensible? If the research is combined with a second discipline: is the relationship between the second domain and economics described in a critical way? |
| Approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the complex key concepts and methods correctly applied? To what extent is the interaction between analysis and theory critically described? To what extent does the thesis give insight in the societal dimension? |
| Interpretation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the conclusions transparent and traceable? Are students' creative inspirations explained? To what extent has the societal relevance been incorporated? Are all conclusions justified and based on the research conducted? Are the conclusions drawn consistent with the introduction? Does the thesis contain a critical reflection on the conclusions and the research conducted? Does the thesis contain a critical self-reflections on one's own views and interests? |
| Written presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree does the thesis transfer knowledge clear and unambiguous? Has the thesis been written in an academic language and style? Can the tables and figures be read independently? To what extent is the thesis free of errors or spelling mistakes, and follows the APA6-style. |
| Process | <p>Does the thesis show that the student can work independently?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the student formulate the research question and problem definition independently? Was the research appropriate? What was the level of the review of the literature? Were the research design and planning realistic? How well did the student cope with feedback; both from students and supervisors? And does the master thesis demonstrate ingenuity, daring and relevance? |

General interpretation standard:

Poor: The student does not reach the standard described, or the use of terminology is **inconsistent or incorrect**. Application of concepts is **inappropriate**. The student displays **minimal analytical skills**. The student communicates information that **may not always be relevant**. The student attempts to structure the work, but it may be **unclear** and/or **inappropriate** to the format required.

Moderate: The use of terminology is **mostly accurate and usually appropriate**, though some errors remain. Application of concepts is **not always appropriate**. The student **demonstrates** conceptual awareness and understanding by **describing basic** connections to the subject matter. The student demonstrates **basic** investigative skills. The student communicates information that is **mostly relevant**. The student attempts to structure **and sequence** the work but is **not always successful**. Sources of information are documented, though there **may be omissions or consistent errors** in adhering to conventions.

Sufficient: Terminology is used **accurately and appropriately**. **Relevant** facts and examples are **used to show understanding**. The student provides **accurate** descriptions; explanations are **adequate** but not well developed. Application of concepts is **appropriate but superficial**. The student **attempts** to apply concepts to other situations but is not always successful. The student demonstrates **adequate** investigative skills. The student communicates information that is **relevant**. The student uses a structure **appropriate to the task** and sequences the content **logically**. Sources of information are documented, with **occasional errors** in adhering to conventions.

Good: A **range** of terminology is used accurately and appropriately. Application of concepts is **appropriate and shows some depth**. The student **applies** concepts to other situations. The student demonstrates **effective** investigative skills. The student communicates information that is **always relevant**. The student organizes information into a **well-developed and logical sequence**, appropriate to the format required. All sources of information are **documented according to a recognized convention**.

Excellent: The student shows an **excellent command of a wide range** of terminology, and uses it appropriately. An **extensive range** of relevant facts and examples are used to show understanding. Application of concepts is **appropriate and sophisticated**. The student applies concepts **effectively** to other situations. The student demonstrates **sophisticated** investigative skills. The student communicates information that is **always relevant**. The student organizes information into a **well-developed and logical sequence**, appropriate to the format required. All sources of information are **documented according to a recognized convention**.