

Assessment Matrix Bachelor Thesis EOR

	5 or lower	6	7	8	9 or 10
Research question	Question is unclear or illogical. Question is not functional (does not cover actual content of thesis/is not guiding in structuring the research). Question is too simple or too limited for the programme or the study load.	Adequate and functional research question, but lacking originality (e.g. mainly a replication of earlier work) and/or set at a minimum level of ambition.	Adequate and functional research question including one or more elements with the potential to add marginally to the existing literature; set at a level of ambition broadly appropriate for programme and study load.	Well-formulated and clearly functional research question, with the potential to add significantly to the existing literature, set at a level of ambition which is clearly more than adequate for the programme and study load.	Original research question, displaying unusual insight and skill to translate relevant issues into well-formulated and researchable questions.
Positioning in literature	Literature review is unfocused, or not functional. No or hardly any academic literature used. Reveals significant lack of understanding of the literature reviewed. Failure to relate research question to existing literature.	Literature review is adequate, but not original, stays close to textbook levels or relies heavily on existing reviews. Includes at least some of the key references that may be expected for this question. Reveals some problems of understanding and difficulties in selecting and ordering relevant materials.	Research question is adequately positioned in the existing literature. May rely on existing reviews, but also provides evidence of student's own reflection. The literature review is broadly functional in guiding own research, and shows a reasonable understanding of the issues. A fair number of the relevant key references are discussed.	Extensive and well-organized literature review. A degree of originality in bringing together several strands of literature, and/or evidence of clear determination to find less obvious but relevant materials. Clear demonstration of critical skills in assessing and reviewing previous research. Review clearly focused on own research.	Exhaustive review of complex literature, without benefit of earlier reviews. Insightful analysis that strongly drives own research. Very clear and persuasive articulation of how own research contributes significantly to previous research.
Research design	Research design is not appropriate to address research question. Design contains evident logical errors or omissions that prevent reliable conclusions. Research design is too simple or too limited for programme or study load.	Research design is basically sufficient to yield marginally persuasive results. Design is based on well-established and routinely used approaches in the literature. Does not reflect the state of the art but includes considerable simplifications or shortcuts. Efforts in data collection, theory development or application of theory at a minimum level of adequacy for study load.	Research design is clearly appropriate to address research question. Does not match state of the art, but shows awareness of important design issues and some reflection on own design choices. May be based on well-established approaches, but contains a modicum of originality. Efforts in data collection, theory development or application of theory are broadly appropriate for study load.	Well-considered and well-explained design. Clear evidence of reflection on design issues. May not fully reflect state of the art, but reflects a good understanding of the current state of research and a clear understanding of the significance of own research design choices. Efforts in data collection, theory development or application of theory show a willingness to go an extra mile.	Research design that fully reflects the state of the literature. Addresses methodological issues that are well beyond what is covered in this programme. Very extensive efforts in data collection theory development or application of theory.
Description and analysis of results	Poorly organized. Contains important errors of interpretation or logic; reveals lack of understanding of own research approach.	Standardized and/or mechanical presentation of results. Broadly effective, but inefficient or somewhat clumsy presentation. Contains minor errors of interpretation. Minimal critical ability regarding robustness or reliability of findings. Considerable unused potential for further analysis.	Adequate and generally readable presentation, broadly in line with standard academic practice. Largely correct analysis of findings. Showing reasonable awareness of key issues in analysis and interpretation of the data, theoretical results or implications for application, with some attention paid to alternative interpretations or robustness of findings.	Well-organized and thoughtful presentation of results, showing a good understanding of the nature of the data, generality of theoretical results, or the implications for applications, and many of the issues in interpretation. Chosen research approach has been correctly followed in all aspects. Potential of the data has been fully utilized.	Very thorough analysis, showing a deep understanding of the research question, the research design, and the data. Presentation is highly effective in conveying a clear view of the nature and limitation of the data, theoretical results or applications, and of the precise nature and degree of reliability of the findings.
Conclusion and discussion	No clear answer to research question, or an answer that does not follow from the research findings. No reflection on contribution to literature. No or trivial suggestions for further research (e.g. 'collect more data').	Research question is answered by simple summary of findings. Minimal attempt to relate to existing literature. Perfunctory discussion of limitations and suggestions for further research.	Functional summary of findings, leading to discussion of extent to which research question is or is not answered. Contribution to existing literature articulated. Meaningful reflection on limitations of own research. Some suggestions for further research that could be useful.	A well-considered review of the findings in the light of the research question and the literature review. Shows a clear understanding of limitations of own research. Several suggestions for further research that are properly explained and that are clearly meaningful and practical.	Succeeds in putting the findings and the research question in the widest possible context, drawing out significant implications for theory development, research methodology and practice.
Editorial quality	Would be unacceptable in a professional setting, unfit for publication on VU website.	Would not be to the author's credit in a professional setting, but might be acceptable for internal use in an organization. Fairly frequent errors in spelling or syntax, poorly conceived structure of many paragraphs and sections. Some sloppiness in references.	Generally adequate in the light of academic standards. Notwithstanding occasional slips, it is evident that reasonable care has been bestowed on spelling, syntax, structure, tables, figures and references.	A document of good quality, thoughtfully written, readable, and carefully edited to high academic standards.	A high-quality document, an engrossing read, a powerfully expressed and persuasive argument. Very rigorous editing.
Poster presentation	Would be unacceptable in a professional setting. Poster unclear, not well explained.	Would not be to the author's credit in a professional setting, but might be acceptable for internal use. Poster and its explanation could be more clear, but a reasonable attempt has been done.	Generally adequate in the light of academic standards. Reasonable care has been bestowed on the structure and presentation of the poster.	A poster of good quality, thoughtfully made and presented to high academic standards.	A high-quality poster. Very well made and presented.
Degree of independence	Student has been unable or unwilling to take meaningful initiatives or to advance own ideas, yet has largely ignored suggestions for improvement. Assistance from third parties has not been discussed with the supervisor.	Has required extensive coaching regarding all aspects of the thesis, but has shown a general willingness to work, to accept guidance and suggestions, and to learn. Possible help from third parties has been discussed with the supervisor.	Has required a normal level of coaching, but student has also displayed own initiatives. Student has been willing to accept advice and suggestions, but has during discussions also been willing and able to defend own choices.	Student has worked largely independently. A large proportion of the thesis reflects the student's own thinking and initiatives. Has kept supervisor well informed of plans and progress.	Student can fairly take (almost) all credit for an original and high-quality thesis.