**Master Dissertation Conflict and Development Assessment form**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student's name**: | **Supervisor's name**: | |
| Study programme :  Name of assessor:  Title of dissertation: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………… | | |
| Form: □ Scientific paper □ Policy report □ Jour article | | |
| The matrix below is used to indicate the rating of the master's dissertation in terms of a number of dimensions. For each of these dimensions, the assessor can indicate whether the master's dissertation was sufficiently developed (meeting the minimum quality requirements), and/or has certain slight or serious shortcomings. In addition, the assessor can also indicate whether and how certain dimensions deserve special recognition because of their good or excellent character   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Excellent | good | sufficient | slight shortcoming(s) | serious shortcoming(s) | | Embedding in literature and possible theoretical perspective |  |  |  |  |  | | Question and problem definition |  |  |  |  |  | | Data and sources |  |  |  |  |  | | Method and analysis |  |  |  |  |  | | Discussion and conclusion |  |  |  |  |  | | Writing Style and Presentation |  |  |  |  |  | | Oral defence |  | | | | | | Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |   Notes (incl. on oral defence), and overall final assessment.   |  | | --- | |  |   Signature Date: Appendix 1: Non-exhaustive listing of quality indicatorsExcellent: General: The degree of excellence increases according to whether the student has succeeded in achieving it in a truly independent manner and with a high degree of ownership.  **Embedding in literature and possibly theoretical perspective**  - Thoroughly master the finer points of academic debate, which manifests itself in being able to identify and demonstrate gaps in the existing literature  - Providing an excellent overview of the main academic issues related to a given topic and the way researchers position themselves in these debates by structuring themselves. In doing so, also explicitly looking for academic consensus and the differences between researchers (regarding methods used, interpretations, conclusions, etc.).  - Thinking theoretically 'out of the box': questioning, supplementing or correcting common interpretations in a responsible way  - Bibliography: use of literature that is relevant, current, diverse and of high scientific quality  **Question and problem statement**  - Problem statement and research questions, with subquestions and hypotheses build convincingly on detected gaps in existing research or can make a real contribution to academic debate, e.g., in a field where there is little agreement among researchers.  - Making the added value of one's own research explicit  **Data and sources**.  - Use of the most appropriate and current sources for the planned research.  - Critical reflection on own data collection.  - Supplementing existing data data with own work (e.g., adding context information to conduct multilevel research, supplementing quantitative data with in-depth interviews, proper use of advanced techniques, etc.)  **Method and analysis**.  - Strategically thoughtful and explicit research design (which may include a literature review)  - Bold research design, with some risk of failure (e.g., study of mental well-being in asylum centers, data collection abroad, elite interviews, etc.)  - Clear interpretation of findings; identify the interaction between the technical and meaning-oriented interpretation of results findings  - Substantive interpretation: strongly meaning-oriented interpretation of research findings, demonstrating thorough understanding of the research domain.  **Discussion and conclusion**.  - Transcends merely describing and summarizing the results, through the highly analytical presentation of results  - Demonstrates the capacity for "meta-reflection": making clear feedbacks to existing theories or insights and interpreting the innovative contribution of the research  - Critically reflect on the limitations of one's own research with meaningful and feasible suggestions for follow-up research ...  **Writing style and presentation**  - Particularly clear paragraph structure  - Dynamic and academically correct language across the board, but not unnecessarily complex language Good: The quality indicators for "excellence" are largely also found in a master's dissertation that scores "good," but the master's dissertation is less consistently of the very highest level. Satisfactory: The quality indicators for "excellence" are also found in a master's dissertation that scores "satisfactory," but the level is lower and the student explicitly missed opportunities that could have raised the level. Slight deficiencies: The following list is a non-exhaustive list of a number of errors that can be labelled as "minor deficiencies":  **Research question and theoretical framework**   * A partial or non-updated representation of the academic debate on the theme * Research design seems to be a mere replication of previous research, without explicit explanation or justification of the added value of this research * Limited number of factual errors, which do not affect the essence of the research.   **Data and methodology**   * The choice for a certain method and data is not sufficiently justified in relation to the research question * Research methods are correct, but the reason for choosing a certain method and data is not sufficiently substantiated * No or little critical reflection on data collection   **Analysis**   * Errors when processing the material which, however, do not (fundamentally) undermine the conclusion * Inadequately justifying analyses (for example, coding of interviews is not sufficiently justified) * Analysis of the results is correct, but without feedback to the research question and / or academic debate   **Discussion and conclusion**   * Little (meta) reflection on the link with / potential relevance for the field * Little or no reflection on the limitations of one's own research (for example, with regard to representativeness), no meaningful and feasible suggestions for further research   **Writing Style and Presentation**   * Unnecessary and / or irrelevant elaborations, which make the master's dissertation less fluent. * Structure and composition are illogical and / or insufficiently justified * The whole dissertation shows little coherence, despite the fact that the individual chapters are good * At times the language is too subjective (instead of academic) * Sloppiness when citing sources * A limited number of sloppy errors due to carelessness (DT and typing errors, layout, graphs, etc.)   **Serious shortcomings:**  The following list is a non-exhaustive list of a number of errors that can be labelled as "minor deficiencies":  **Research question and theoretical framework**   * The absence of a clear research question that is relevant to the discipline * No or insufficient embedding of the research question in the appropriate literature * Completely insufficient substantive outline of the academic debate * A large number of factual errors in the presentation of the academic debate or factual errors with regard to the core of the theme   **Data and methodology**   * Limited data collection, which can at most serve as a pilot for later research (for example, one or two interviews) * Irrelevant method of data collection in function of concrete research question (for example,   **Analysis**   * Non-justified or completely incorrect application of analysis techniques and / or statistical techniques * Mere impressionistic or clearly subjective analysis of (qualitative) data. * No justification of or reference to relevant techniques   **Discussion and conclusion**   * No feedback to the initial research question and / or to the literature * Drawing completely incorrect conclusions based on the results obtained * No recognition of clearly present bias (for example, selective response)   **Writing Style and Presentation**   * Completely illogical or chaotic structure of paragraphs, chapters and / or entire master's dissertation * Barely understandable Dutch or English (for example, large number of sentences that are grammatically incorrect and / or not understandable, pronouns, etc.) * Non-academic / subjective / ideologically tinted language across the board   **Research integrity**  - Plagiarism (see Section 9 of the FOER).  - Master's dissertation-or parts of it-that are very clearly not the result of the student's independent work (which may surface, among other things, through the student's pertinent inability to explain the theoretical framework, analyses, or other crucial elements of the master's dissertation intelligibly at the oral defense) | |  |

# BIJLAGE 2 : Indicative points table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Quotering | Categorie | Criteria |
| 18-20 | Exceptionally good | No deficiencies at all. On all or almost all dimensions the master dissertation scores excellent.  Across the board, the master's dissertation has an original and creative character. The originality and further elaboration originated from the student's own initiative, who even took a certain amount of risk. |
| 16-17 | Excellent | On all dimensions, the master's dissertation scores very good to excellent. There is at most one slight deficiency offset by very high scores on other dimensions. |
| 14-15 | Good | The master's dissertation contains at most some slight deficiencies and generally has at least a decent score on the various dimensions. |
| 12-13 | Acceptable | The master's dissertation contains several slight deficiencies. |
| 10-11 | Barely acceptable | The master's dissertation balances on the edge of a serious deficiency. But in all other areas, the dissertation is consistently of acceptable quality. |
| 9-8 | Unacceptable | The master's dissertation contains one or more serious deficiencies, making the master's dissertation unacceptable. A reworking of one or more dimensions is required, but the body of the master's dissertation can be used as a starting point for the reworking. |
| 7-0 | Completely unacceptable | The master's dissertation contains several serious deficiencies that make the master's dissertation unacceptable as a whole. Large portions of the master's dissertation will require fundamental rework. |