RSM *Erasmus*
ERASMUS UNIVERSITY

RSM ERASMUS UNIVERSITY

MASTER (MSc) THESIS ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

1 IDENTIFY A RESEARCH QUESTION AND PROJECT DESIGN	**2** WRITE A CRITICAL REVIEW	**3** DEFINE WORKING CONCEPTS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS	**4** COLLECT AND ANALYSE RESEARCH DATA	**5** DEFINE, VALIDATE AND EVALUATE SOLUTIONS / MODELS, INTERPRET FINDINGS SENSITIVELY AS A BASIS FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS	**6** WRITE A PERSUASIVE, WELL STRUCTURED MASTER THESIS	**7** RESEARCH ETHICS AND MANAGEMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS AND PROCESSES	**8** MASTER THESIS PRESENTATION AND ORAL DEFENCE OF CANDIDATE
Excellent - 9-10							
Well-balanced and innovative composition of research question, project design and research method	Literature review is itself a significant contribution	Significant additions to the theoretical / conceptual understanding of the subject	Contribution to development and methods for collecting and analysing research material and/or methodological debate	Sophisticated interpretation of the material. The conclusions are based on the findings but transcend them	Work of art written with style and with strong arguments	Research and its management has contributed demonstrably to enhanced concerted action or understanding of two or more parties involved in the research	Superior mastery and power in defending the research in its setup, methodology and execution
Very Good Distinction Level - 8-9							
Clear and specific research question, project design and research method	Literature well described / evaluated from new or complex perspectives	Attempt, maybe not wholly successful, made to theorise beyond current state of literature	Modifies and develops research methods reflecting methodological understanding	Sophisticated interpretation of findings and conclusions are firmly based but show a creative spark	Clear and persuasive and well-structured document	Research manages the project carefully and sensitively with open mindedness in the face of interests of parties in the research	Under scrutiny managing to defend or justify choices, methods and conclusions made, while showing proficiency in transparent communication
Good - 7-8							
Well-defined research question, sensible project design and clear plans for conducting research	Literature cogently evaluated using positions already available in literature	Conceptual framework is developed, or existing one adapted, in context of evaluated literature	Uses methods for gathering and analysing research material well and shows an understanding of methodological issues	Uses techniques for interpretation in a mechanical way. Conclusions based well on findings	Expressed well or technically correct (but not both). Clear structure, adequately argued	Research has been carried out open minded or sensitively (but not both)	Answering questions but not always confident and well-prepared
Competent Pass Level - 6-7							
Explicit ideas but there are some doubts about relation between question, design and methods	Good description of appropriate field(s) and some general criticisms made, but no close evaluation of concepts	Concepts clearly defined and appropriate, set in the context of literature	Methods for gathering and analysing research are used competently	Findings are treated as straightforward and unproblematic. Conclusions have some connection with the findings	Adequate expression but several mistakes. Argumentation sometimes replaced by assumption or assertion	Research is managed straightforwardly but has not explicitly addressed issues of contextual interests and concerns	Taking effort in answering questions, sometimes looses focus and tendency to enter into irrelevant issues
Borderline Fail - 5-6							
Identified interesting topic but broad research question, while design and methods are vague	Inadequate or limited description of literature, and / or no criticism or evaluation	Definition and use of theoretical concepts is confused and no attempt made to theoretical synthesis or evaluation	Methods for gathering data and analysing research material are confusing and unsystematically used	Occasional insight takes the place of interpretation and conclusions have a tenuous link with findings	Sentences often do not make sense, therefore using bullets to disguise lack of arguments	No understanding of impact, on interest or concerns of parties in the research	Occasionally showing effort giving precise answers but often wanders into feeble excuses, showing lack of abstract argumentation
Fail - < 5							
Project focus, purpose and method are unclear	Author appears to have read little and understood less	No conceptual or theoretical discussion of any value	No primary research of any value	Not providing evidence knowing what the outcome is about	Scrappy presentation, illogical structure, no arguments or silly ones	Research has treated interests and concerns of parties in an arbitrary way	Giving ambiguous answers and showing clear lack of systematic, abstract thinking