## Appendix 8 Requirements for review and recommended form

**Review**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the thesis:** | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Title of the thesis: (in Estonian):** | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Author:** | |  | | --- | |  | | |
| **Reviewer’s (name, position, affiliation):** | |  | | --- | |  | | |
| **Reviewer’s degree (title)** | |  | | --- | |  | | |

***Hint:*** *Please mark the assessments with a cross, if desired, you can add more specific comments to the boxes below the assessments.*

1. **Research problem, aim of the graduation thesis, research questions, hypotheses**

Clarity, justification and topicality of research problem, aim and research questions. Interconnection between the aim and research questions. Presence of clear hypotheses matching the problem. Conformity of the contents of the thesis to the problem and aim. Logic and articulation of the thesis structure.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| failed | poor | satisfactory | good | very good | excellent |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Theoretical/empirical background**

Conformity and suitability of chosen theoretical approaches for solving/addressing the research problem. Sufficient coverage of theoretical/empirical literature for understanding and explaining the research problem. Sufficient count of appropriate, timely (field-specific) references and proper interpretation of sources.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| failed | poor | satisfactory | good | very good | excellent |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Research methods and data**

Sufficient, clear, introduction of chosen quantitative or qualitative research methods and their suitability for achieving the aim and answering research questions. Appropriate use of data collection methods. Compliance and sufficiency of empirical material/data/sample for solving research problem, reliability of data.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| failed | poor | satisfactory | good | very good | excellent |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Solving the research problem/analytical quality of the research**

Quality of analysis/discussion: ability to analyse the data and link the results of the analysis with theoretical/empirical standpoints. Conformity of results with the aim and research questions: clarity, relevance, timeliness and factuality of discussion; association between conclusions, proposals recommendations and analysis; validity, legitimacy and consistency of conclusions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| failed | poor | satisfactory | good | very good | excellent |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Formatting quality**

Formatting conformity to valid requirements, incl. language use, quality of referencing.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| failed | poor | satisfactory | good | very good | excellent |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strengths of the thesis:** | |  | | --- | |  | | |
|  |  | |
| **Weaknesses of the thesis:** | |  | | --- | |  | | |
|  | |  |
| Questions: | | |  | | --- | | 1.  2.  3. | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Grade suggested by the reviewer:**

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment scale: 0 („F”) – „ failed ”; 1 („E”) – „ poor ”; 2 („D”) – „ satisfactory ”; 3 („C”) – „ good ”; 4 („B”) – „ very good “; 5 („A”) – „ excellent ” |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date:** |  |

**Signature:**