**Form 2c - Evaluation Form Research Master’s Thesis Research Proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of research project: | Assessing the performance of Occam's window for Bayesian model averaging |
|  |  |
| Student name: | David Coba |
|  |  |
| Student ID card number: | 12439665 |
|  |  |
| Reviewer name: |  |
|  |  |
| Role: | Thesis committee member / Second assessor |
|  |  |
| Status (1st version or revision): | First draft |

*Please indicate your overall evaluation below, based on your evaluation of the specific points on the following pages. If your overall evaluation is ‘not assessable’ then the proposal is not approved and you can circle ‘0’.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **Overall evaluation:** | **2** | Approved (i.e., the research master’s thesis project can continue; start data collection/analysis).  *The student responds in a response letter point-by-point to the comments and submits this at CANVAS.* |
|  |  |  |
|  | **1** | Conditionally approved (i.e., the proposal has some deficits that need to be revised before the research master’s thesis project can continue).  *The student revises the research proposal and writes a response letter with a point-by-point response how the comments are handles, and submits the revised proposal with the response letter at CANVAS.* |
|  |  |  |
|  | **0** | Not approved (i.e., the research master’s thesis proposal has severe deficits that need to be revised before the research master’s thesis project can continue).  *The student revises the research proposal and writes a response letter with a point-by-point response how the comments are handles, and submits the revised proposal with the response letter at CANVAS.* |
|  |  |  |

*When completed with the evaluation, please upload your evaluation in CANVAS, using the Speedgrader in Modules - ‘Submit research proposal’ and attach the completed evaluation form. The assigned thesis committee member will compose a decision letter based on her/his evaluation and the second assessor’s evaluation.*

*Please state your judgment on each specific item on this form using the denotation stated below (2, 1, 0, X), together with a (short) explanation. Obviously students are best served with concrete, concise and constructive feedback.*

*Your evaluation (per item, as well as the overall evaluation) can be either of the following:*

2 – Approved

1 – Conditionally approved

0 – Not approved

X – Not assessable (Not clear enough / not enough information to be able to make a proper judgment)

**A RESEARCH PROPOSAL**

1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

3.1 **Prior research**

* *Is the problem/research question described in a clear and concise manner?*
* *Is previous literature leading up to the research question adequately described?*
* *Is it clear what the contribution of the proposed research is in light of previous literature?*
* *Is the discussion of the previous literature well-structured and ordered?*
* *Is the theoretical background clear?*
* *Does the proposal in general have a clear structure and flow?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

3.2 **Research question and hypotheses**

- *Does the research question follow logically from the theoretical background?*

- *Does the research question translate into specific, clear and testable research model/ expectations/ hypotheses?*

* *Are the research model/ expectations/ hypotheses well-founded and logically related to underlying psychological mechanisms?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

1. **PROCEDURE**

- *Are the research model/ expectations/ hypotheses operationalized in a clear and correct manner in an experimental design?*

- *Are the proposed measures and DVs properly described and justified (incl. validity and reliability; are proposed interventions adequate)?*

- *Is the suggested sample (category, control groups, sample size) properly justified?*

* *In case new or adjusted instruments or measures (e.g., questionnaires) are used, is the new instrument first validated before use in the main experiment? If not, is there a proper justification and indication on how the data from this measure can be interpreted?*

- *Is the choice of statistical techniques (per hypothesis) properly justified and explained?*

*- Is there room for modification of the intended procedure, or is there ample motivation why not?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

**B ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RESEARCH PROPOSAL**

1. **INTENDED RESULTS**

* *Are the intended results clearly formulated?*
* *Are the intended results related to the specific and more general research questions?*
* *Is there a clear reflection on alternative interpretations in case results turn out differently?*
* *Is it clear what results will lead to falsification of theory and research model/ expectations/ hypotheses?*
* *What is the innovative value of the research in scientific and / or practical and societal terms?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

1. **WORKPLAN AND FEASIBILITY**

- *Is the proposed planning realistic and expedient?*

* *Is the proposed research feasible and sensible in terms of size and investment in terms of time?*

- *Is the proposed research realistic in terms of recruitment of participants?*

* *Is the proposed research realistic in terms of infrastructural needs (e.g., place of execution, used materials)?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

**C LEARNING AIM / EFFECT AND OVERALL JUDGMENT**

1. **LEARNING AIM / EFFECT**

* *At the end of this research project, is it your judgment that the student will be able to independently think of a research question, and set up / run an empirical study to test research model/ expectations/ hypotheses derived from the research question?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements:

1. **FINAL JUDGMENT**

* *Are the previous sections generally positively evaluated?*
* *Are the previous sections in balance with each other?*
* *What is the quality of the proposal as a whole?*
* *What is your judgment on the structure, readability, and length of the proposal?*

Evaluation (2, 1, 0, X) :

Explanation and any suggestions for improvements: