**Pro Gradu – Master’s thesis evaluation criteria**

Master’s thesis is graded from 1-5.

**5 / Excellent**

**Research question(s)**
Research question is genuinely challenging, innovative and unique. Structure of the thesis is focused. Definition(s) of the research question(s) is precise and well-founded and the view/angle is fresh.

Artistic part / productions goals established in an excellent and creative way in relation to the research problem.

**The theoretical part**

Strong knowledge of the theories, theoretical starting point of the work is well founded, in-depth understanding of the concepts, critical use of sources, using of theories is comprehensive, clear and in-depth analytical approach.

Artistic part’s / production’s expressive, material, technical and productional premises are justified and tied to the scientific background theory. Interaction between the arts and sciences is done in creative way which adds value to both.

**Methods / empirical part / data**

Legitimate choice of methods, the process know-how is sovereign, comprehensive and appropriate data, data processing is in-depth, thorough and systematic, clear connection to the theoretical framework.

Artistic part / production’s method has been perfected.

**The results**

The work produced new, high-quality results. The research objectives were met. The conclusions show innovation and expertise.

Artistic part / production is responding to the presented research question, and interact with it to produce significant information about the study. The results are of considerable scientific, artistic, or productional value in their own field.

**Overall Rating**

Text is fluent and style used is excellent, the structure is clear and consistent and the layout is flawless. The study shows mature and creative thinking, analytical approach - a genuine researcher's work. The study opens up new perspectives to its own field of art / design.

Artistic expression is well-articulated, and of very good standard.

**The work process**

The work process is of high-level, the student is motivated, is self-reliant in the work process and is a self-motivated researcher. Active participation in the seminars.

**4 / Very good**

**The research question(s)**

An interesting and fresh research project, definitions of the research questions are well-founded, structure of the research work is precise and the view / angle is appropriate.

Artistic part’s / production’s objectives are clearly defined and consistent in relation to the research problem.
 **The theoretical part**

Convincing theoretical knowledge, theoretical starting point of the work is functional, using of concepts is a skilled, well-argued discussion, using of sources is convincing, the overall image of the work is good. Artistic part 's / production 's expressive , material , technical and productional premises are justified and tied to the scientific background theory in a consistent and structured way.

**Methods / empirical part / material**

Functional choice of methods, the process know-how is good, the data used is comprehensive and appropriate, data processing is accurate, clear connection to the theory used.

Artistic part / production as a research method is described well and it is being developed during the process.

**The results**

The work produced new results. The research objectives were met. The conclusions are clear and creatively justified and demonstrate good overall control of the topic. Theoretical background and researcher’s own findings are balanced well.

Artistic part / production is responding consistently to the presented research question. The result is extensive and shows a mature artist and the designer's ability.

**Overall Rating**

Text is fluent, style used is correct, error-free language and the structure is clear and logical, the layout is finalized.

Artistic expression is well- articulated and of good standard. The study demonstrates creative thinking and the ability to intelligent reasoning.

**The work process**

The work process goes well, the student is motivated, self-reliability in the work process is good. Active participation in the seminar.

**3 / Good**

**Research question(s)**

Research question is relatively interesting and fresh. Structure of the research is functional, cropping/editing appropriate.

Artistic part/ production is well defined in relation to the objectives and research questions.

**The theoretical part**

Good knowledge of the theories, key concepts understood, assumptions and hypotheses in line with the definition of the research question, almost comprehensive use of source materials, using of sources is appropriate.

Artistic part’s / production’s expressive, material, technical and productional premises are justified and tied to the scientific background theory clearly.

**Methods / empirical part / material**

The work is methodologically correct and empirical part has been carried out properly. The material used is more or less comprehensive. Links analysis and theory.

Artistic part / production as a research method is described and it has partly affected the research and it is being appraised.

**The results**

Interpretation of the results and conclusions is of a good standard and the research questions are being answered using theoretical framework.

Artistic part / productions is answering to the presented research question.

**Overall Rating**

Text is more or less smooth, style is relatively easy to read, the language just about without an error. Structure of the text is clear, appearance of the work is neat. The work shows good technical thesis-making control.

Quality of the artistic section is mostly good.

**The work process**

The work process goes mostly well, the student has some inconsistency in motivation. Pertinent participation in the seminar.

**2 / Satisfactory**

**The research objective**

The research objective is somewhat conventional, relatively clear definition of the problems, the viewing angle is conventional.

Artistic part / production is reasonably well defined in relation to the objectives and the research question(s).

**The theoretical part**

The theoretical framework iss a little unorganized and narrow. Concepts, hypotheses and assumptions are partially clearly defined. Using relatively little relevant literature. Genuine critical approach is missing.

Artistic part’s / production’s expressive, material, technical and productional premises are justified and tied to the scientific background theory satisfactorily.

**Methods / empirical part / material**

Selection of method is somewhat justified, the method is applied mechanically, there are some compatibility problems between method, data and research questions. Data processing is partly one-sided.

Artistic part / production as a research method is structured poorly and reciprocal impact to research is limited and there is a lack of a description of the method.

**The results**

Set research questions remain in some part unanswered, interpretive opportunities are not fully exploited. Drawn conclusions are relatively simple.

**Overall Rating**

Text is relatively functional; the style is sometimes difficult to understand. The work has some inconsistencies, the structure is not always justified, own contribution to the work is relatively low. There are some ambiguities in usage of references.

Artistic expression is on a satisfactory level. There are weaknesses in the realization of the work and the visual expression, the working method is one-sided.

**The work process**

Difficulties in the work process; motivation, responsibility and participation in seminars variable.

**1 / Sufficient**

**The research objective**

Research objectives are conventional. Incompetence in setting structural focus is causing inadequate handling of the topics. There are major inconsistencies in definitions.

Artistic part / production only passably defined in relation to the objectives and research questions.

**The theoretical part**

The theoretical framework is limited. Definition of terms is inadequate, assumptions and hypotheses remain vague and their relationship to the whole does not work. Only little literature used; perhaps only from domestic sources. Source criticism is missing.

Artistic part’s / production’s expressive, material, technical and productional premises are justified and tied to the scientific background theory flimsily (weakly?).

**Methods / empirical part / material**

A non-functional and/or unsubstantiated choice of method(s). Problems in using the chosen method makes it difficult to process data. Unorganized data creates obstacles to making a good analysis of it. There are problems how the analysis and the theory are linked.

Artistic part / production is not structured as a research method, and the interaction is not easily discernible, and the description is very incomplete.

**The results**

Research results are questionable, simple or incomplete. There are problems with fulfillment of the research objectives. Conclusions are missing or do not meet the purpose of the research.

Artistic part / production cannot respond in all parts to the research question or the answer is very incomplete.

**Overall Rating**

The work has major inconsistencies, it is structurally unjustified, and the text is clumsy. There are issues with language, technical matters and appearance (unfinished). There are deficiencies in using references. Overall impression is incomplete or connection to subject is thin.

Artistic expression is on a sufficient level. There are weaknesses in the realization of the work and the visual expression.

**The work process**

Student’s motivation was rather weak, fickle responsibility for the work process, problems in keeping the schedule ​​. Participation in seminars was limited.