AMSP "Philology and Applied Linguistics"
(program code 45226, D02DQ)

MASTER´S THESIS GRADING RUBRIC

The Master's Thesis elaborated within the AMSP "Philology and Applied Linguistics" is assessed on a 10-point scale in accordance with the regulatory enactments of the Republic of Latvia and in accordance with the "Regulations on Studies at Daugavpils University" (approved at the meeting of the DU Senate on April 3, 2024, Minutes No. 5), using the "Master's Thesis Evaluation Rubric" developed for this purpose (see Table below), which indicates the Master's Thesis evaluation criteria and their evaluation scale with descriptions of achievement levels.

I. RESEARCH
1.1. Planning and research process *(max. 20 points)*

	0 = insufficient	1-3	4-5	6	7-8
Theme: topicality, compliance of the title with the content of the paper Identification of **the research object**, its description and substantiation	The author defines and describes the studied phenomenon poorly or fails to define it altogether. The author gives a few reasons to justify his/her choice of topic, but the reasons fail to form a whole.	The author describes and defines the phenomenon, but in a disconnected or inadequate manner. The author justifies his/her choice of topic well.	The author describes and defines the studied phenomenon and related key concepts clearly. The author justifies his/her choice of topic well, and the reasons form a logical whole. The thesis addresses a question not studied previously.	The author describes and defines the studied phenomenon and related key concepts clearly and comprehensively. In addition, the author justifies his/her choice of topic from the point of view of theory building, previous research and practical needs.	In addition to meeting the criteria for the lower grades, the author links the studied phenomenon to a wider scientific (theoretical or methodological) context. In addition, the author justifies his/her choice of topic with insight and from the point of view of theory building, previous research and practical needs. The reasons provided create a synthesis of previous knowledge. The studied phenomenon and its research tradition are problematized well.

	0 = insufficient	1	2	3	4
Formulation of the aim(s) and objectives (objectives comply with the aim of the paper and cover all the tasks to be implemented)	Absent, no evidence	Incomplete and/or unfocused formulation of the aim(s) and objectives.	States the paper's aim in a single sentence, enumerates the objectives.	Clearly states the paper's aim in a single sentence, enumerates the objectives.	Clearly and concisely states the paper's aim in a single sentence, which is engaging, and thought provoking. The objectives fully comply with the aim of the paper and cover al the tasks to be implemented.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Formulation and quality **of the research question and/or hypothesis** (the research question is analytical, complies with the aim of the research and is explorable / the hypothesis is justified and may be checked by means of the methods chosen)	There is no researchable research question and/or hypothesis and the delineation of the research is absent. No link is made to existing research on the topic. No research context is described.	The research question and/or hypothesis is unclear, or not researchable and the delineation of the research is weak. The link between the thesis research and existing research does not go beyond the information provided by the supervisor.	The research question and/or hypothesis is mostly clear but could have been defined sharper at some points. Context of the research is defined well, with input from the student. There is a link between the context and the research question.	The research question and/or hypothesis is clear and researchable and the delineation of the research is clear. Context of the research is defined sharply and to-the-point. The research question emerges directly from the described context.	The research question and/or hypothesis is clear and formulated to-the-point and limits of the research are well-defined. Research is positioned sharply in the relevant scientific field. Student is able to indicate the novelty and innovation of the research.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Application of the appropriate **methods of research and data collection** for the implementation of the research objectives	No description of methods and analysis of data collection provided.	Some aspects of the project regarding methods and analysis of data collection are described insufficiently. Used methods and analysis of data collection are not always appropriate.	Description of methods and analysis of data collection is lacking in a number of places. Used methods and analysis of data collection mostly appropriate.	Description of methods and analysis of data collection is mostly complete, but there are lacking some details. Used methods and analysis of data collection are appropriate.	Description of methods used and analysis of the data collection is appropriate, complete and clear.

1.2. Literature Review *(max. 20 points)*

	0 = insufficient	1	2	3	4	5
Sources used (their quality and compliance with the aim, question /hypothesis of the research:	No peer-reviewed/primary scientific papers in reference list except for those already suggested by the supervisor.	There are virtually no sources that are professionally reliable. Most of the references are from sources that are not peer-reviewed	Some peer-reviewed papers in reference list, but also a significant body of gray literature. Although most of the references are	Relevant peer-reviewed papers in reference list, but also some gray literature or text books. Some included references less relevant.	Mostly peer-reviewed papers or specialized monographs in reference list. An occasional reference may be less relevant.	Almost exclusively peer-reviewed professional papers, journals or other approved sources in reference list or specialized

primary/secondary, national/international (including a reasonable amount of the latest publications)		and have uncertain reliability. The reader seriously doubts the value and accuracy of the material presented.	professionally legitimate, a few are questionable. The reader is uncertain of the reliability of some of the sources.			monographs. All papers included are relevant. The reader is confident that the information and ideas can be trusted.
	1 – 3	**4 – 5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9 – 10**
Analysis of sources: evaluating, criticizing and producing persuasive arguments in defense of the suggested point(s) of view	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it to the research problem and question, and/or fails to identify relevant literature. Student is not able to organize literature and come to a synthesis.	Reports on earlier literature without connecting it clearly to the research problem and question. Student is able to organize the literature, but is not able come to a synthesis that results in own insights, hypotheses or conclusions independently.	Student is able to organize literature and comes to a synthesis that results in own insights, hypotheses or conclusions; but the way the literature is used does not clearly contribute to answering of the research question.	Reviews earlier literature relevant to the research problem and question. Student is able to organize literature and comes to a synthesis that results in own insights, hypotheses or conclusions which contribute to the research question.	Student is able to organize literature and critically evaluates the quality of his literature sources. He comes to a synthesis that results in own insights, hypotheses or conclusions which contribute to the research question.	Demonstrates critical thinking, creativity and insight in reviewing earlier literature relevant to the research problem and question. Student is able to organize literature and critically evaluates the quality of the literature sources. S/he comes to an original synthesis that results in own original insights, hypotheses or conclusions which contribute to the research question.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Documenting sources: compliance with the rules of referencing in quoting, paraphrasing and summarizing	Does not cite sources. Citation format is not observed.	Cites some data obtained from other sources. Citation format is not observed.	References are seldom cited to support statements. Citation format not always observed. Student is often inconsequent in references in the text and/or reference list or often references are lacking. .	Although attributions are occasionally given, many statements seem unsubstantiated. The reader is confused about the source of information and ideas. Citation mostly format is observed. Student is sometimes inconsequent in references in the text and/or reference list.	Professionally legitimate sources that support claims are generally present and attribution is, for the most part, clear and fairly represented. Citation format almost always observed.	Compelling evidence from professionally legitimate sources is given to support claims. Attribution is clear and fairly represented. Citation format consistently observed. Student uses one format for references in the text and reference list.

1.3. Implementation of the theory *(max. 20 points)*

	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Relevant, valid, and sufficient data	Fails to clarify what material/data is used or how it is used; or uses inappropriate material/data; or exhibits inappropriate use of material/data.	Identifies appropriate material/data and explains how it is used.	*The features of the description at this level are common to the features described at levels 1 and 3.*	Clearly identifies appropriate material/data and explains how it is used; uses material/data in a way that is consistent with the logic of the inquiry and its purpose.	The features of the description at this level are common to the features described at levels 3 and 5.	Clearly identifies appropriate material/data and explains how it is used; uses material/data in a way that is consistent with the logic of the inquiry and its purpose. Identifies problematic issues and limits to the use of the material/data.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Ways of data processing (systematization, analysis) and interpretation, substantiated in the paper	Student is lost when using data. Provides unclear interpretations and conclusions, and/or provides conclusions that do not logically emerge from the research; provides no discussion.	Student is able to organize the data, but is not able to perform checks and/or simple analyses. Makes some interpretations and draws conclusions; provides little discussion.	Student is able to organize data and perform some simple checks; but the way the data are used does not clearly contribute to answering of the research question and/or he is unable to analyse the data independently.	Student is able to organize the data, perform some basic checks and perform basic analyses that contribute to the research question. Provides clear interpretations that emerge from analysis and draws logical conclusions; identifies some limitations of the results	Student is able to organize the data, perform commonly used checks and perform some advanced analyses on the data.	Student is able to organize the data, perform thorough checks and perform advanced and original analyses on the data. Identifies and discusses problematic issues and limits; where relevant, provides possible alternative interpretations or conclusions.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Evidence and appropriateness of the use of the material from the theoretical part; cohesion between the parts	Text is fragmented and unbalanced; internal links among theory, methods and results are not explicit; problems with headings and paragraph and section structure. No discussion and/or reflection on the research. Discussion only touches trivial or very general points of criticism. No confrontation with existing literature.	Text is not fully balanced; some key internal links are missing; does not fully form a coherent whole; some problems with headings and paragraph and section structure. Student identifies only some possible weaknesses and/or points at weaknesses which are in reality irrelevant or non-existent. Some confrontation with	Some confrontation with existing literature but incomplete and irrelevant. Some confrontation with existing literature, some relevance.	Forms a balanced and coherent whole; some internal linkages are implicit rather than explicit; headings and paragraph and section structure typically support the overall coherence. Student indicates most weaknesses in the research and is able to weigh their impact on the main results relative to each other. Student identifies only most obvious conflicts	Student indicates all weaknesses in the research and weighs them relative to each other. Furthermore, (better) alternatives for the methods used are indicated. Student shows minor and major conflicts and correspondences with literature and can identify the added value of his research relative to existing literature.	Forms a coherent whole with consistent and explicit internal linkages; has a logical flow of argumentation with neat headings and clearly structured paragraphs and sections. Student is able to identify all possible weaknesses in the research and to indicate which weaknesses affect the conclusions most.

	existing literature but incomplete and irrelevant.		and correspondences with existing literature. Student tries to describe the added value of his study but does not relate this to existing research.		Student critically confronts results to existing literature and in case of conflicts is able to weigh own results relative to existing literature. Student is able to identify the contribution of his work to the development of scientific concepts.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Conclusions (resulting from the research results and their analysis, providing answer/s to the research question; their formulation)	No link between research question, results and conclusions.	Conclusions are drawn, but in many cases, these are only partial answers to the research question. Conclusions merely repeat results or conclusions are not substantiated by results.	Conclusions are linked to the research question. Some conclusions are not substantiated by results or merely repeat results.	Most conclusions well-linked to research question and substantiated by results. Conclusions mostly formulated clearly, but some vagueness in wording.	Clear link between research question and conclusions. All conclusions substantiated by results. Conclusions are formulated exact.	Clear link between research question and conclusions. Conclusions substantiated by results. Conclusions are formulated exact and concise. Conclusions are grouped/ordered in a logical way.

II. WRITTEN PAPER *(max. 20 points)*

	0 = insufficient	**1-3**	**4-5**	**6**	**7-8**
Organization and structure: presence of all the required structural elements of the paper **Layout**	Master's thesis is badly structured. In many cases information appears in wrong locations. Level of detail is inappropriate throughout.	Main structure incorrect in some places, and placement of material in different chapters illogical in many places. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information given).	Main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy of sections is not logical in places. Some sections have overlapping functions leading to ambiguity in placement of information. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information given).	Most sections have a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is mostly correct. Ordering of sections is mostly logical. All information occurs at the correct place, with few exceptions. In most places level of detail is appropriate.	Well-structured: each section has a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordering of sections is logical. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Written expression: use of language, register, uniformity of style and terminology	Not enough to evaluate	Uses nonacademic style; inaccurate language use interferes with reading and comprehension.	Uses language sufficiently accurately and appropriately for comprehension but use of illustrations and examples	Uses appropriate academic language well; minor errors may exist but do not interfere with fluent reading and	Produces a thesis that meets academic writing standards; readily conveys meaning; illustrations and

	infrequent and/or not fully competent;	comprehension; illustrations and examples contribute to the clarity of the arguments.	examples enhance the clarity of the arguments.

	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Standard of accuracy: grammar, spelling, punctuation	Language incorrect and unreadable. Spelling and grammar errors too many to count.	Language incorrect and very hard to read. Spelling and grammar errors so numerous that they make the thesis almost impossible to understand.	Language basically correct and readable. Spelling and grammar errors present, but at acceptable quantities.	Language correct and pleasant to read. Some spelling and grammar errors.	Language fluent and pleasant to read. Few spelling and grammar errors. Language is (almost) at the level of what is written in peer-reviewed journals.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Consistency in the use of **terminology**	Formulations in the text are often incorrect/inexact inhibiting a correct interpretation of the text.	Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occurs regularly and it affects the interpretation of the text. Many words are used inappropriately, confusing the reader.	The text is ambiguous in some places, but this does not always inhibit a correct interpretation of the text. Word choice is merely adequate, and the range of words is limited. Some words are used inappropriately.	Formulations in text are predominantly clear and exact. BSc thesis report could have been written more concisely. Word choice is generally good. The writer often goes beyond the generic word to find one more precise and effective.	Formulations in text are clear and exact, as well as concise. Word choice is consistently precise and accurate.

III. ORAL PRESENTATION *(max. 20 points)*

	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4 – 5**
Language Use and Delivery *The student communicates ideas effectively.*	Not enough to evaluate.	Uses eye contact ineffectively. Fails to speak clearly and audibly and uses unsuitable pace. Does not engage audience. Selects words inappropriate for context; uses incorrect grammar.	Some eye contact, but not maintained. Speaks clearly and unclearly in different portions. Occasionally engages audience. Selects words inappropriate for context; uses incorrect grammar.	Maintains eye contact. Speaks clearly and uses suitable volume and pace. Takes steps to engage the audience. Selects words appropriate for context and uses correct grammar.	Effectively uses eye contact. Speaks clearly, effectively and confidently using suitable volume and pace. Fully engages the audience. Selects rich and varied words for context and uses correct grammar.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4 – 5**
Organization and Preparation *The student exhibits logical organization.*	Not enough to evaluate.	Does not clearly introduce the topic. Does not establish or maintain focus on the topic. Uses ineffective transitions that rarely connect points. Ends without a conclusion.	Introduces the topic. Somewhat maintains focus on the topic. Includes some transitions to connect key points. Ends with a conclusion based on evidence.	Introduces the topic clearly. Maintains focus on the topic. Include transitions to connect key points.	Introduces the topic clearly and creatively. Maintains clear focus on the topic. Effectively includes smooth transitions to connect key points.

	0 = insufficient	1	2	3	4 – 5
				Ends with coherent conclusion based on evidence.	Ends with logical, effective and relevant conclusion
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4 – 5**
Content *The student explains the process and findings of the project and the resulting learning.*	Not enough to evaluate.	Does not clearly define the topic or thesis. Does not support the thesis with evidence. Presents little or no evidence of valid research. Shows little evidence of problem solving and learning stretch. Shows little evidence of the combination of ideas.	Defines the topic or thesis. Supports the thesis with evidence. Presents evidence of research with sources. Provides some evidence of problem solving and learning stretch. Combines existing ideas.	Clearly defines the topic or thesis. Supports the thesis and key findings with evidence. Presents evidence of valid research with multiple sources. Provides evidence of problem solving and learning stretch. Combines existing ideas to form new insights.	Clearly defines the topic or thesis and its significance. Supports the thesis and key findings with an analysis of relevant and accurate evidence. Provides evidence of extensive and valid research with multiple and varied sources Provides evidence of complex problem solving and learning stretch. Combines and evaluates existing ideas to form new insights.
	0 = insufficient	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4 – 5**
Questions and Answers	Not enough to evaluate.	Demonstrates incomplete knowledge of the topic by responding inaccurately and inappropriately to questions and feedback.	Demonstrates some knowledge of the topic by responding accurately and appropriately to questions and feedback.	Demonstrates knowledge of the topic by responding accurately and appropriately to questions and feedback.	Demonstrates extensive knowledge of the topic by responding confidently, precisely and appropriately to all audience questions and feedback.

Transfer of points to grades:

Points	Grade
Positive evaluation	
96-100	10 (with distinction)
86-95	9 (excellent)
77-85	8 (very good)
67-76	7 (good)
57-66	6 (almost good)
48-56	5 (satisfactory)
33-47	4 (almost satisfactory)
Negative evaluation	
23-32	3 (unsatisfactory)
11-22	2 (bad)
1-10	1 (very bad)