

FEEDBACK FORM MASTER'S DISSERTATION II

Name student:	Name promotor:
----------------------	-----------------------

Thesis' title:

Name reviewer: (co-)Promotor Reviewer

In consultation with

Academic year: Evaluation period: 1 2

Evaluation (only) by (co-)Promotor.					
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Independence and own contribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Attitude	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Domainspecific Content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation y (co-)Promotor and Reviewer					
	1	2	3	4	5
4. Defining the problem and research question	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Selection and description of the literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Analysis of the data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Reporting results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Discussion and conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Ethics, deontology and datamanagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1 = level is unacceptable. There are fundamental shortcomings and thorough revision is necessary.
 2 = level is very mediocre. There are several serious shortcomings that undermine the value of the thesis.
 3 = level meets the minimal requirements. There are several small shortcomings.
 4 = level goes beyond the necessary requirements. There are no notable flaws.
 5 = level goes beyond expectations and might even be called 'professional'. There are hardly any shortcomings.

Extra comments (at least 3 to 4 lines; mandatory to fill in):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1. Independence and own contribution

- a. Was the student independent (e.g., independently searching the literature, getting acquainted with APA rules)?
- b. Did the student show initiative (e.g., contacting supervisor, following relevant seminars, working together with students, ...)?
- c. How large was the student's contribution for the entire Master dissertation?

2. Attitude

- a. Did the student cooperate well with colleagues, staff, and other people involved in the research?
- b. Did the student interact adequately with clients and participants?
- c. Did the student's behavior meet common ethical guidelines for the profession?
- d. Did the student appear motivated and persevering during the process?
- e. Did the student respect the appointments (e.g., by being there on time, showing responsibility, ...)?
- f. Did the student show a constructive attitude towards feedback (e.g., did he/she accept the feedback, was the feedback implemented in the text in a useful manner,...)?

3. Domainspecific Content

- a. Are the most important visions and research traditions in the domain acknowledged and well presented?
- b. To what extent is all relevant research cited?

4. Defining the problem and research question

- a. Is the research question original and relevant for the research domain?
- b. Is the problem accurately defined, well outlined and presented in a way that is easy to follow for the reader.
- c. Is the theoretical, practical, and/or methodological importance of the study demonstrated adequately?

5. Selection and description of the literature

- a. Are the most important visions in the research field acknowledged?
- b. Is relevant, initial, qualitative and recent research cited?
- c. Are the right conclusions drawn from the literature (no misinterpretations or overstatements)?
- d. Is the literature described in a critical way (are shortcomings, conflicting findings or obscurities in the field noticed?)
- e. Is cited research organized and presented in a logical and sensible way?
- f. Are all the variables and theoretical concepts that are included in the study introduced (definition, distinction from other variables and argumentation why the variable is relevant)?

- g. Are the expected relationships between the variables discussed and adequately specified? (e.g. form of interactions)

6. Methodology

- a. Is the choice for either quantitative or qualitative research well motivated?
- b. Is the chosen sample and research setting adjusted to the research question and the research design?
- c. Are the sample and research setting adequately described and justified (e.g. is there a description of how participants have been recruited and selected)?
- d. Is the research design justified and is it adapted to the specific research questions and/or hypotheses?
- e. May the measurements or data lead to reliable and valid representations of the studied concepts?
- f. Is the adopted research design conceived in such a way that possible threats for internal and external validity have been controlled as good as possible, taking into account what is taught in the psychology program for quantitative and qualitative research? Is the balance between internal and external validity acceptable?

For quantitative research:

- a. Are the chosen constructs operationalized in an acceptable way?
- b. Is the reliability and validity of the used measurements sufficiently demonstrated?

For qualitative research:

- a. Are the sample and method suited for an in-depth understanding of the studied phenomenon?
- b. Does the chosen methodology allow to investigate the chosen constructs in an acceptable way (e.g. are the interview data sufficiently informative in function of the research question)?
- c. Is the context of the research sufficiently described in function of applicability of the results in future research and other settings (e.g. clinical practice)?

7. Data Analysis

- a. Is the method of analysis suited (not too complex or too simple) to obtain an answer to the formulated research questions and/or hypotheses?
- b. Are the different steps in the (quantitative or qualitative) data-analyses sufficiently explained and motivated?

For quantitative research:

- a. Have the most important statistical assumptions been taken into account in the conduct of the analyses (e.g., power, measurement level, (in) dependence of measurements ...)?
- b. Have suitable levels of significance and data-analysis techniques been used to avoid Type-I and Type-II errors the best as possible?

For qualitative research:

- a. Is the interpretative method sufficiently specified, and, if applicable, is the theoretical framework that is used for data interpretation sufficiently clear?
- b. Is it sufficiently clear how the raw data is related to themes and results?
- c. Is it sufficiently clear how reliability and validity of interpretations is guaranteed?
- d. Is there sufficient attention for diversity in the raw data (e.g. sufficient attention for extreme cases, attention for contradictory data).

8. Reporting results

- a. Have the results been reported in an exhaustive, well-organized, consistent and logical way?
- b. Are all transformations of the raw data adequately described?
- c. Has the most appropriate conclusion been reported based on the analysis that has been conducted?

For quantitative research:

- a. Have descriptive statistics (means, SD, intercorrelations, ...), *p*-values and effect sizes been reported?
- b. Have tables, figures and graphs been reported to clarify the results?

For qualitative research:

- a. Are the findings well-documented, starting from the raw data (e.g. have sufficient citations from the data been used, is there sufficient attention for detail and data complexity)?
- b. Does the dissertation provide a coherent interpretation that surpasses the descriptive level (e.g. are thematic data patterns and relations sufficiently elaborated)?
- c. Are the raw data sufficiently related to the studies theoretical constructs?

9. Discussion and conclusions

- a. Are conclusions correctly derived from research design and data-analysis?
- b. Are the findings discussed in light of the research hypotheses/questions and aims of the study?
- c. Has a subjective interpretation of the results clearly been separated from an objective summary of the findings?
- d. Have the findings been discussed in light of alternative studies, have the findings been placed within a broader context, and has sufficient attention been given to the discussion of the theoretical and/or practical implications of the findings?
- e. Has sufficient attention been given to the discussion of alternative interpretations and divergent or unexpected findings?
- f. Have the limitations and weaknesses of the study been discussed in a critical and realistic way?
- g. Have meaningful directions for future research been formulated (e.g. applicability of the results)?

10. Structure

- a. Does the thesis and its sections have a clear and logical structure?
- b. Is there coherence between the individual sections?
- c. Is each section well-balanced and structured adequately?

11. Presentation

- a. Has the student used correct professional and academic language, adapted to that currently used in the research field? Is the thesis as a whole easy to read?
- b. Is the thesis typographically well done?
- c. Does the thesis follow the formatting guidelines (APA format with regards to citations, references, figures and tables, size, format,...)?

12. Ethics, deontology and datamanagement

- a. Did the student's behavior meet the common ethical guidelines of the profession?
- b. Did the student act in compliance with the ethical norms, common for this type of research and in the faculty (<https://www.ugent.be/pp/nl/onderzoek/ec#Regelsenprotocollen>), and is this sufficiently explained?
- c. Was informed consent applied?
- d. Was the contribution of third parties appropriately acknowledged (assistance for part of the research, use of data and materials of third parties, etc)?
- e. Does datamanagement meet common good practices for this type of research, and is this sufficiently explained?

13. Additional comments

It is obligatory to give additional comments. If a master's thesis is evaluated as exceptionally bad or good, it is good practice to provide some additional comments. If a student has been given a negative evaluation, more detailed comments may help him/her in revising the master's thesis. Does the reviewer foresee a possibility to publish the master's thesis? Which steps/revisions would be needed in order to achieve this?