

University of Jyväskylä			Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences		
MATRIX FOR THE EVALUATION OF MASTER'S STUDY PROJECTS (INCLUDING THEORETICAL MASTER'S STUDY PROJECTS) from 1.8.2024					
The Master's thesis must follow good scientific practice and research ethics principles at all stages of the research process in accordance with the guidelines of the Research Ethics Advisory Board.					
Please note that the Master's thesis is assessed as a whole, in which the weighting of the areas to be assessed may vary.					
A grade of 2 is between 1 and 3. It has features of both grades 1 and 3.					
A grade of 4 is between 3 and 5. It has features of both grades 3 and 5.					
An accepted thesis must meet at least the learning outcomes of the thesis and the criteria for grade 1.					
<b>Area of assessment</b>	<b>Sufficient (1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Very good (4)</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>
<b>Research topic</b>	The presentation of the research topic and the justification for the choice are incomplete. The link to the discipline is noticeable. The objectives of the work remain somewhat vague. The scope of the topic is too narrow or too broad in relation to the scope of the thesis.		The research topic is relevant to the discipline. It has been presented and its relevance scientifically justified. The topic is clearly linked to relevant previous research. The objectives of the work are clear. The scope of the topic is well defined in relation to the scope of the thesis.		The research topic is relevant to the discipline and may even have theoretical, practical or societal significance. The presentation of the topic and the scientific justification are excellent. The work is competently linked to key research in the field. The objectives of the work are ambitious and feasible. The delimitation of the topic is excellent in relation to the scope of the thesis.
<b>Research design and questions</b>	There is a lack of clarity and/or coherence in the research design. The research questions are not fully appropriate and/or are poorly formulated.		The research design is clear and coherent. The research questions are appropriate and/or challenging, well justified and clearly formulated.		The research design is clear and shows creativity and innovation. The research questions are ambitious, imaginative and scientifically interesting.

<b>Research framework</b>	<p>The research framework is largely relevant to the research task, but fragmented and/or incomplete. The theory/concepts in the field are addressed but the definition is incomplete and/or vague. Sources are partly irrelevant and one-sided. The background remains disconnected and its relation to the objectives of the study is vague.</p>		<p>The research framework demonstrates knowledge of the subject and of the theories/concepts relevant to the field. The delineation is largely successful, and sources are appropriately selected. The treatment of sources and theories is clear, but to some extent declarative. Key concepts are described or defined and used consistently and correctly. The theoretical/conceptual background is well supported by the objectives of the study.</p>		<p>The research framework is in-depth and well-defined. It demonstrates an excellent command of the theoretical/conceptual framework. Sources have been chosen competently and used in a wide range of ways. Perspectives are linked and sources are used critically. An evaluative and reflective approach is adopted. Concepts are used with skillful application. Theoretical/conceptual background systematically supports the research objectives.</p>
<b>Data and methods</b>	<p>The chosen data and/or research methods are not in line with the objectives of the study. Methods are presented, but there is no in-depth knowledge of them. There are clear shortcomings in the choice and justification of the methods and in the delimitation and presentation of the data. The research ethical principles that guided the collection and management of the data are described.</p>		<p>The chosen data and/or research methods are in line with the objectives of the research. The presentation and discussion of the methods demonstrate mastery of the field. Methodological choices are justified by reference to relevant methodological literature. The choice and delimitation of data is justified. The data, how they were collected and how they were used are described in sufficient detail. The research ethical principles that guided the collection and management of the data are clearly described.</p>		<p>The chosen data and/or research methods are well adapted to the objectives of the study. Critical reflection and use of methods demonstrate excellent mastery of the field. Methodological choices and their implications have been competently discussed with reference to relevant methodological literature. The material has been selected and presented with merit. The research ethical principles that guided the collection and management of the data are described in detail and in depth.</p>
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>The analysis shows some mastery of the chosen method. The analysis is largely reliable, but it is mechanical, superficial and/or inaccurate.</p>		<p>The analysis shows a good command of the chosen method. The analysis is accurate and reliable.</p>		<p>The analysis shows excellent mastery of the chosen method. The analysis is insightful, systematic, accurate and reliable.</p>

<b>Presentation of results and reflection</b>	The results of the study are presented, but there is not enough reflection on them. The study partially answers the questions raised. The presentation of the results may be fragmented or declarative. The relationship of the results to the research framework is unclear and/or incomplete. There is little reflection and conclusions are superficial or mechanical. Some claims and/or findings are not substantiated.		The results of the study have been presented in a logical manner and their relevance and validity have been discussed. The study responds well to the questions raised and the interpretations of the results are related to the theoretical/conceptual framework and to previous studies. The reflection and conclusions are at a good level. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed. Arguments and/or findings are substantiated. The research provides new knowledge or a new perspective on research in the field.		The presentation and discussion of the results of the study is insightful and demonstrates expertise in the field. The study provides excellent answers to the questions raised and the interpretation of the results in relation to the theoretical framework and previous studies is competent. The reliability of the research and/or the research process itself has been assessed in depth. The arguments and/or findings are well substantiated. The theoretical and/or empirical contribution of the research is presented and evaluated in a commendable manner.
<b>Thesis as a text</b>	There are structural and/or stylistic shortcomings in the reporting of the survey. The argumentation is not logical in all respects. The thesis does not form a coherent whole in all respects. There are shortcomings in the way references are marked		The research is largely reported in a clear and consistent manner. The reasoning is logical. The thesis forms a coherent whole. The text is built on a dialogue of source material. The thesis is written in a good factual style. The conventions for citing references are followed.		The study is reported in a very clear and consistent way. The argumentation is logical and convincing. The thesis forms a coherent whole, skilfully and competently written. The thesis is written in a convincing scientific style, following the conventions of the field. The use of references is almost flawless.
<b>Process management and independent work (assessed by the supervisor)</b>	There were clear shortcomings in the research process and in time management. Self-motivation, autonomous input and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been poor.		The research process has progressed according to the agreed schedule. There has been good self-motivation, independent input and ability to seek and receive feedback.		The research process has proceeded in a very structured and efficient way. The self-motivation, independent input and ability to seek and receive feedback has been excellent.

University of Jyväskylä	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences				
ASSESSMENT MATRIX FOR MULTI-FORMAT THESES PROJECTS from 1.8.2024					
The Master's thesis must follow good scientific practice and research ethics principles at all stages of the research process in accordance with the guidelines of the Research Ethics Advisory Board.					
Please note that the Master's thesis is assessed as a whole, in which the weighting of the areas to be assessed may vary.					
A grade of 2 is between 1 and 3. It has features of both grades 1 and 3.					
A grade of 4 is between 3 and 5. It has features of both grades 3 and 5.					
An accepted thesis must meet at least the learning outcomes of the thesis and the criteria for grade 1.					
<b>Area of assessment</b>	<b>Sufficient(1)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Very good (4)</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>
<b>Subject of the work and setting the task</b>	The presentation of the topic and the justification for the choice of the topic are incomplete. The link to the discipline is noticeable. The objectives of the work remain somewhat vague. There are shortcomings in the clarity, coherence and/or contextualisation of the terms of reference. The scope of the topic is too narrow or broad in relation to the scope of the thesis.		The subject of the work is relevant to the discipline. It has been presented and its relevance scientifically justified. The topic is clearly linked to relevant previous research. The objectives of the work are clear. The setting of the task is coherent and linked to an appropriate context. The delimitation of the topic is workable in relation to the scope of the thesis.		The subject of the work is relevant to the discipline and may even be of practical or societal importance. The presentation of the topic and the scientific justification are excellent. The work is expertly linked to key research. The objectives of the work are ambitious and feasible. The setting of the task and its connection to the appropriate context is clear and shows creativity and innovation. The delimitation of the topic has been excellently executed in relation to the scope of the given thesis.
<b>Framework</b>	The research framework is largely relevant to the research task, but fragmented and/or incomplete. The theory/concepts in the field are addressed but the definition is incomplete and/or vague. Sources are partly irrelevant and one-sided. The background remains disconnected and its relation to the objectives of the work is vague.		The research framework demonstrates knowledge of the subject and of the theories/concepts relevant to the field. The delineation is largely successful, and sources are appropriately selected. The treatment of sources and theories is clear, but to some extent declarative. Key concepts are described or defined and used consistently and correctly. The theoretical/conceptual background is well supported by the objectives of the work.		The research framework is in-depth and well-defined. It demonstrates an excellent command of the theoretical/conceptual framework. Sources have been chosen competently and used in a wide range of ways. Perspectives are linked and sources are used critically. An evaluative and reflective approach is adopted. The use of concepts is insightful. Theoretical/conceptual background is systematically

					supported.
<b>Output or work</b>	The link between the output/work and the background of the work is tenuous. The whole of the output/work is not fully functional and the choices made are not sufficiently justified. The output/work does not achieve all the objectives set for it.		The link between the output/work and the context of the work is clear. The background and the output form a functional whole. The choices made are well justified. The output/work achieves its objectives.		The linkage of the output/work to the work context is rich and/or deep. Together, the background and the output form a functional and innovative whole. The choices made are well justified. The output/work achieves its objectives in an excellent way.
<b>Reflection, assessment and evaluation</b>	Reflection on the output/work of the work is superficial and not particularly analytical. The evaluation of the success of the output/work is fragmented and not particularly reflective. There is little evaluation of the achievement of the objectives of the work. There is little reflection on personal development.		Reflection on the output/work shows analytical skills. The evaluation of the success of the output/work is fairly consistent and reflective. The achievement of the objectives of the work is assessed in relation to previous research. Reflection on personal development.		The reflection on the realisation of the work (output) is particularly analytical and structured. The evaluation of the output/work is highly systematic and reflective. The achievement of the objectives of the work is assessed in a comprehensive and in-depth way in relation to previous research. There is a commendable reflection on personal development.

<b>Thesis as a text</b>	<p>There are structural and/or stylistic shortcomings in the reporting of the thesis. The argumentation is not convincing. The thesis does not form a coherent whole in all respects. There are shortcomings in the way references are marked.</p>		<p>The thesis is reported in a clear and coherent manner. The argumentation is logical and convincing. The thesis forms a coherent whole. The thesis is written in a good factual style. The conventions for citing references are followed.</p>		<p>The thesis is reported in a very clear and coherent way. The thesis forms a coherent whole, skilfully and competently written. The thesis is written in a convincing scientific style, following the conventions of the field. The use of references is almost flawless.</p>
<b>Process management and independent work (optional, assessed by supervisor)</b>	<p>There were clear shortcomings in the work process and time management. Self-motivation, autonomous input and the ability to seek and receive feedback were poor.</p>		<p>The work process has progressed according to the agreed schedule. There has been good self-motivation, independent input and ability to seek and receive feedback</p>		<p>The work process has proceeded in a very planned and efficient way. Self-motivation, independent input and the ability to seek and receive feedback have been excellent.</p>