Veszprém, the 20th January 2016
Ref. nr.: MFTK-AAI-2/2016

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION
OF MASTER'S (MA) THESES IN ENGLISH

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The candidate demonstrates with his/her thesis that after having regular consultations with his/her supervisor, s/he is capable of elaborating a subject of academic relevance while fulfilling all the requirements of conducting research and producing scholarly discourse of unquestionable academic integrity. The main purpose of this summary of guidelines is to set up a valid, reliable and transparent system of criteria for evaluation. The given criteria will serve as a basis for the final evaluation of students' theses.
The thesis will be assessed by the supervisor and a second assessor.

1. CONCEPT PLAN

The candidate is expected to define his/her topic and the scope of research as well as justify his/her choice. Furthermore, the candidate is required to demonstrate an ability to relate his/her research questions to the relevant field of study and elaborate clearly the relationship between his/her own findings and extant scholarship.

The thesis should go beyond the mere uncritical recycling of received knowledge. The unacknowledged representation of others' findings as the candidate's own will result in an automatic failing grade.

The candidate is expected to handle the research material with a critical attitude. It is also essential that the candidate's hypothesis/hypotheses should be set up by a thorough consideration of its/their relevance to the research question(s) raised.

Excellent (5 points)	*The topic is well defined and the choice is thoroughly justified both theoretically and practically. The objectives are closely and profoundly linked to relevant scholarship. The candidate adopts a critical vantage point. The candidate's own research findings are clearly demonstrated.*
Good (4 points)	*The topic is defined and justified, but the objectives are only partly linked to relevant scholarship, thus the relationship between the candidate's own research findings andextant scholarship is somewhat blurred.*
Satisfactory (3 points)	*The topic is reasonably well-defined and justified but relevant scholarship is not addressed in its entirety. The candidate's critical reflection is limited.*

Pass (2 points)	*The topic is not well defined and is justified only by the candidate's own personal interest. The candidate's findings are not related to relevant scholarship. No critical reflection is shown.*
Fail (1 point)	*The topic is neither defined nor justified. The objectives and the candidate's findings are not related to relevant scholarship. No critical reflection is shown.*

2. METHOD

Three aspects are to be considered here: firstly, the cogency of the theoretical framework; secondly, the selection and successful implementation of research methods; thirdly, the elaboration of the argumentation culminating in a persuasive conclusion.

Excellent (5 points)	*The theoretical framework defined is appropriate and is completely justified. The selected research methods and tools are conceptually sound. All the conclusions drawn are persuasively argued.*
Good (4 points)	*The theoretical framework defined is appropriate but not completely justified. The selected research methods and tools are conceptually reasonable. Most of the conclusions drawn are adequately argued.*
Satisfactory (3 points)	*The theoretical framework is reasonably defined though appropriate. The selected research methods and tools do not reflect a conceptually sophisticated approach. The argumentation falters and the conclusions drawn are superficial.*
Pass (2 points)	*The theoretical framework is haphazardly defined. The rationale behind the choice of research methods and tools is barely noticeable. The argumentation is unconvincing; the thesis is mostly descriptive. The conclusions drawn are inadequate and/or ambiguous.*
Fail (1 point)	*The theoretical framework is ill-defined or even lacking. There is no attempt at applying any research methods and tools. The thesis is wholly descriptive; no argumentation is discernible. The conclusions drawn are unfounded.*

3. STRUCTURE, FORM AND TYPOGRAPHY

The structure of the thesis should be proportionate. The layout should meet the formal requirements (see the EASI homepage: http://angolweb.uni-pannon.hu).

Excellent (5 points)	*The thesis is well-organised, logically structured, the layout complies with the formal requirements; global and linear cohesion is achieved.*
Good (4 points)	*The structural requirements are met, but the thesis may be slightly disproportionate. Cogency is generally apparent. The formal requirements are mostly met.*
Satisfactory (3 points)	*The structural requirements are met by and large but the chapter structure is disproportionate. Cogency is partially achieved. The formal requirements are mostly met.*
Pass (2 points)	*There is no conscious attempt at creating a balanced and proportional structure. Cogency is barely manifested. Typographic errors slightly disturb understanding. Formal requirements are mostly met.*
Fail (1 point)	*The structure of the thesis is hardly discernible: the division of (sub-)chapters is illogical. Cogency is barely manifested. Typographic errors interfere with textual understanding. Formal requirements are unmet.*

4. **STYLE, LANGUAGE, SPELLING**

These criteria refer to the fluency of the text, the requirements of formal language use, and the demand of a high level of English proficiency. Spelling mistakes due to careless editing entail the automatic rejection of the thesis work.

Excellent (5 points)	*The text is fluent, wording is explicit. The text demonstrates an appropriate and consistently accurate range of grammatical structures. Its vocabulary is rich and appropriately used throughout attesting to a high level of English proficiency. Spelling norms are followed. There are virtually no typing errors.*
Good (4 points)	*The text is mostly fluent, wording is mostly explicit. The text demonstrates a mostly appropriate and consistently accurate range of grammatical structures. Its vocabulary is rich and appropriately used throughout attesting to a high level of English proficiency. Spelling norms are followed. There are virtually no typing errors.*
Satisfactory (3 points)	*The text is fluent overall, wording does not hinder understanding. The text demonstrates a mostly appropriate and accurate range of grammatical structures. Its vocabulary is varied and appropriately used. Spelling norms are followed. There are virtually no typing errors.*
Pass (2 points)	*The text is understandable, wording does not hinder understanding. The text demonstrates some grammatical inaccuracies which do not, however, result in serious confusion. It demonstrates a restricted range of grammatical structures and a mostly appropriate vocabulary, which causes no misunderstanding. There are only occasional problems with the cohesion and coherence of the text. Spelling norms are followed. There are virtually no typing errors.*
Fail (1 point)	*The vocabulary of the thesis is limited. The text demonstrates many grammatical inaccuracies, which result in confusion. There are frequent problems with the cohesion and coherence of the text. Spelling mistakes abound.*

Each of the above criteria is assessed on a separate five-point scale. The maximum score is 20 points for the thesis from each assessor.

1. Concept	5□ 4□ 3□ 2□ 1□
2. Method	5□ 4□ 3□ 2□ 1□
3. Structure, form and typography	5□ 4□ 3□ 2□ 1□
4. Style, language, spelling	5□ 4□ 3□ 2□ 1□

At the defence of the thesis the candidate may gain an additional 20 points.

The final grade is calculated as follows: (20+20)/2 points + 20 points

    40-35 points: 5
    34-29 points: 4
    28-23 points: 3
    22-18 points: 2
    17 points and below: 1

If the candidate receives 1 point for any of the four criteria, then the final grade of the thesis is an automatic Fail.

Éva FORINTOS, PhD
acting chair, associate professor