University of Jyväskylä			Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences		
ASSESSMENT MATRIX FOR MASTER'S THESES (INCLUDING THEORETICAL MASTER'S THESES) From 1 November 2026					
Please note that a Master's thesis is assessed as a whole, and the relative weighting of the different components may vary.					
Grade 2 falls between grades 1 and 3. It exhibits characteristics of both grade 1 and grade 3.					
Grade 4 falls between grades 3 and 5. It has characteristics of both grade 3 and grade 5.					
A thesis that is to be approved must meet at least the learning outcomes for the thesis and the criteria for a grade of 1.					
Assessment category	**Pass (1)**	**Satisfactory (2)**	**Good (3)**	**Very Good (4)**	**Excellent (5)**
The Master's thesis must adhere to good scientific practice and the principles of research ethics at all stages of the research process, in accordance with the guidelines of the Advisory Board on Research Ethics and the University of Jyväskylä.					
Research topic	The presentation of the research topic and the justification for its selection are inadequate. A connection to the academic discipline is discernible. The objectives of the work remain somewhat vague. The scope of the topic is too narrow or too broad in relation to the specified length of the thesis.		The research topic is relevant to the discipline in question. It has been presented and its significance justified scientifically. The topic is clearly linked to key previous research. The objectives of the work are clear. The scope of the topic is appropriate in relation to the specified length of the thesis.		The research topic is significant within the relevant academic discipline and may even have theoretical, practical or societal significance. The presentation of the topic and its scientific justification are excellent. The work is expertly linked to key research in the field. The objectives of the work are ambitious and achievable. The scope of the topic has been defined excellently in relation to the specified scope of the thesis.
Research design and research questions	There are shortcomings in the clarity and/or consistency of the research design. The research questions are not entirely appropriate and/or there are shortcomings in their formulation.		The research design is clear and coherent. The research questions are appropriate and/or challenging; their selection is well-justified and their formulation is clear.		The research design is clear and demonstrates creativity and innovation. The research questions are ambitious, inventive and of scientific interest.

Research framework	The research framework is largely relevant to the research task but is fragmented and/or incomplete. Theories and concepts within the field are discussed, but their definition is inadequate and/or vague. The sources are partly irrelevant and one-sided. The background information is disjointed and its connection to the research objectives is unclear.		The research framework demonstrates a command of the theories and concepts central to the topic and field. The scope is largely well-defined and the sources have been selected appropriately. The treatment of sources and theories is clear, but to some extent descriptive. Key concepts are described or defined and are used consistently and correctly. The theoretical and conceptual background provides strong support for the research objectives.		The research framework is in-depth and well-defined. It demonstrates an excellent command of the theoretical/conceptual framework. Sources have been selected expertly and utilised in a wide-ranging manner. Perspectives are interwoven, and sources are used critically. The analysis takes an evaluative and reflective approach Concepts are skilfully applied. The theoretical and conceptual background systematically supports the research objectives.
Data and methods	The selected data and/or research methods are not consistent with the research objectives. The methods are presented, but the understanding of them is not in-depth. There are clear shortcomings in the selection and justification of methods, as well as in the delimitation and presentation of the data. The research ethics principles guiding the collection and management of the data are described.		The selected data and/or research methods are consistent with the study's objectives. The presentation and discussion of the methods demonstrate a command of the field. Methodological choices are justified with reference to relevant methodological literature. The selection and delimitation of the data are justified. The data, the method of collection and its use are described in sufficient detail. The research ethics principles guiding the collection and management of the data are clearly described.		The selected data and/or research methods are exceptionally well aligned with the research objectives. The critical reflection on and use of the methods demonstrate an excellent command of the field. Methodological choices and their implications have been expertly considered, drawing on relevant methodological literature. The data has been selected and presented commendably. The research ethics principles guiding the collection and management of the data are described in detail and thoroughly.
Analysis	The analysis demonstrates a certain degree of mastery of the chosen method. The analysis is largely reliable, but it is mechanical, superficial and/or imprecise.		The analysis demonstrates a good command of the chosen method. The analysis is precise and reliable.		The analysis demonstrates an excellent command of the chosen method. The analysis is insightful, systematic, precise and reliable.

Presentation and discussion of results	The research results are presented, but the discussion of them is incomplete. The research partially answers the questions posed. The presentation of the results may be fragmented or merely descriptive. The relationship between the results and the research framework is unclear and/or incomplete. There is little discussion and few conclusions, and those that are present are superficial or mechanical. Some of the claims and/or observations remain unsubstantiated.		The research results are presented logically, and their significance and validity have been discussed. The research addresses the research questions well, and the interpretations of the results are contextualised within the theoretical/conceptual framework and previous research. The discussion and conclusions are of a good standard. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed. The claims and/or observations are substantiated. The research provides new information or a new perspective on research in the field.		The presentation and discussion of the research findings are insightful and demonstrate expertise in the field. The research responds excellently to the questions posed, and the interpretation of the findings in relation to the theoretical framework and previous research is expert. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed in depth. The arguments and/or findings are excellently substantiated. The theoretical and/or empirical contributions of the research are presented and evaluated to a high standard.
The thesis as a text	The research report contains structural and/or stylistic shortcomings. The argumentation is not entirely logical. The thesis does not, in all respects, form a coherent whole. There are shortcomings in the way source references are cited. The text lacks originality. Any use of artificial intelligence has been acknowledged.		The research has been reported largely clearly and consistently. The argumentation is logical. The thesis forms a coherent whole. The text is structured around a dialogue with the source material. The thesis is written in a good academic style. The citation conventions are followed. The text has a distinctive voice. Any use of artificial intelligence has been reported consistently and clearly.		The research is reported very clearly and coherently. The argumentation is logical and convincing. The thesis forms a coherent whole, skilfully and expertly constructed. The thesis is written in a convincing academic style, adhering to the conventions of the discipline. The use of references is virtually flawless. The thesis demonstrates the author's ability to produce insightful academic writing. Any use of artificial intelligence has been reported transparently and reflectively.

Process management and independent work (assessed by the supervisor)	There have been clear shortcomings in the research process and time management. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been satisfactory.		The research process has progressed systematically in accordance with the agreed timetable. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been good.		The research process has progressed in a highly systematic and efficient manner. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been excellent.

University of Jyväskylä		Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences			
ASSESSMENT MATRIX FOR MULTIFORMAT THESES From 1 November 2026					
Please note that a Master's thesis is assessed as a whole, and the relative weighting of the different components may vary.					
Grade 2 falls between grades 1 and 3. It exhibits characteristics of both grade 1 and grade 3.					
Grade 4 falls between grades 3 and 5. It has characteristics of both grade 3 and grade 5.					
A thesis that is to be approved must meet at least the learning outcomes for the thesis and the criteria for a grade of 1.					
Assessment category	**Pass (1)**	**Satisfactory (2)**	**Good (3)**	**Very Good (4)**	**Excellent (5)**
The Master's thesis must adhere to good scientific practice and the principles of research ethics at all stages of the research process, in accordance with the guidelines of the Advisory Board on Research Ethics and the University of Jyväskylä.					
Research topic	The presentation of the research topic and the justification for its selection are inadequate. A connection to the academic discipline is discernible. The objectives of the work remain somewhat vague. The scope of the topic is too narrow or too broad in relation to the specified length of the thesis.		The research topic is relevant to the discipline in question. It has been presented and its significance justified scientifically. The topic is clearly linked to key previous research. The objectives of the work are clear. The scope of the topic is appropriate in relation to the specified length of the thesis.		The research topic is significant within the relevant academic discipline and may even have theoretical, practical or societal significance. The presentation of the topic and its scientific justification are excellent. The work is expertly linked to key research in the field. The objectives of the work are ambitious and feasible. The scope of the topic has been defined excellently in relation to the specified scope of the thesis.

Research design and research questions	There are shortcomings in the clarity and/or consistency of the research design. The research questions are not entirely appropriate and/or there are shortcomings in their formulation.		The research design is clear and coherent. The research questions are relevant and/or challenging; their selection is well-justified and they are clearly formulated.		The research design is clear and demonstrates creativity and innovation. The research questions are ambitious, inventive and of scientific interest.
Research framework	The research framework is largely relevant to the research task but is fragmented and/or incomplete. Theories and concepts within the field are discussed, but their definition is inadequate and/or vague. The sources are partly irrelevant and one-sided. The background information is disjointed and its connection to the research objectives is vague.		The research framework demonstrates a command of the theories and concepts central to the topic and field. The scope is largely well-defined and the sources have been selected appropriately. The treatment of sources and theories is clear, but to some extent merely descriptive. Key concepts are described or defined and are used consistently and correctly. The theoretical/conceptual background provides strong support for the research objectives.		The research framework is in-depth and well-defined. It demonstrates an excellent command of the theoretical/conceptual framework. The sources have been selected expertly and used in a varied manner. Different perspectives are interwoven, and sources are used critically. The treatment of the subject matter is evaluative and reflective. Concepts are skilfully applied. The theoretical and conceptual background systematically supports the research objectives.

Output/work and methods	There are shortcomings in the way the output/work relates to the research task and the theoretical framework. The implementation and discussion demonstrate some mastery of the field. The methods are presented, but the understanding of them is not in-depth. There are clear shortcomings in the implementation and presentation of the output. The principles of research ethics that have guided the work and the entire research project are described.		The objectives and implementation of the work are linked to the research task and the theoretical framework. The implementation and discussion demonstrate a command of the subject area. Methodological choices are justified on the basis of relevant methodological literature. The work is described in sufficient detail. The research ethics principles that have guided the work and the entire research project are clearly described.		The objectives and implementation of the research output are excellently aligned with the research question and theoretical framework. The critical reflection on and application of the implementation demonstrate an excellent command of the field. Methodological choices and their implications have been expertly considered, drawing on relevant methodological literature. The work has been carried out and presented to a high standard. The principles of research ethics that have guided the work and the entire research project have been described in detail and thoroughly.
Analytical assessment and reflection on the work	The reflection on the execution of the work is superficial and not particularly analytical. The assessment of the work's success is fragmented and not particularly reflective. There is little assessment of whether the objectives of the work have been achieved. Reflection on one's own development is minimal.		Reflection on the execution of the work demonstrates analytical thinking. The assessment of the work's success is fairly coherent and reflective. The achievement of the work's objectives is assessed in relation to previous research. There is reflection on one's own development.		Reflection on the realisation of the output/work is particularly analytical and well-structured. The evaluation of the output/work is highly systematic and reflective. The achievement of the work's objectives is assessed comprehensively and in depth in relation to previous research. Reflection on one's own development is commendable.

Presentation and discussion of results	The results of the study are presented, but the discussion of them is incomplete. The study partially answers the questions posed. The presentation of the results may be fragmented or merely descriptive. The relationship between the results and the research framework is unclear and/or incomplete. There is little discussion or drawing of conclusions, and what there is is superficial or mechanical. Some of the claims and/or observations remain unsubstantiated.		The research results are presented logically, and their significance and validity have been discussed. The research addresses the research questions well, and the interpretations of the results are contextualised within the theoretical/conceptual framework and previous research. The discussion and conclusions are of a high standard. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed. The claims and/or observations are substantiated. The research provides new information or a new perspective on research in the field.		The presentation and discussion of the research findings are insightful and demonstrate expertise in the field. The research provides an excellent response to the questions posed, and the interpretation of the findings in relation to the theoretical framework and previous research is expert. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed in depth. The arguments and/or findings are excellently substantiated. The theoretical and/or empirical contributions of the research are presented and evaluated to a high standard.
The thesis as a text	There are structural and/or stylistic shortcomings in the presentation of the research. The argumentation is not entirely logical. The thesis does not, in all respects, form a coherent whole. There are shortcomings in the formatting of source references. There are shortcomings in the text's originality. Any use of artificial intelligence has been reported.		The research has been reported largely clearly and consistently. The argumentation is logical. The thesis forms a coherent whole. The text is structured around a dialogue with the source material. The thesis is written in a good academic style. The citation conventions are followed. The text has a distinct voice. Any use of artificial intelligence has been reported consistently and clearly.		The research is reported very clearly and coherently. The argumentation is logical and convincing. The thesis forms a coherent whole, skilfully and expertly constructed. The thesis is written in a convincing academic style, adhering to the conventions of the discipline. The use of references is virtually flawless. The thesis demonstrates the author's ability to produce insightful academic writing. Any use of artificial intelligence has been reported transparently and reflectively.

Process management and independent work (assessed by the supervisor)	There have been clear shortcomings in the research process and time management. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been satisfactory.		The research process has progressed systematically in accordance with the agreed timetable. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been good.		The research process has progressed in a highly systematic and efficient manner. Initiative, independent contribution and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been excellent.