## Lisa 8 Retsensioonile esitatud nõuded ja soovituslik vorm

**Retsensioon**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Töö pealkiri (eesti keeles):** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
| **Töö pealkiri (inglise keeles):** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
| **Autor:** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
| **Retsensent (nimi, amet, töökoht):** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
| **Retsensendi kraad (nimetus)** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |

***Vihje:*** *Palun märkige kindlasti ristiga hinnangud, soovi korral lisage detailsemad kommentaarid hinnangute all olevatesse kastidesse.*

1. **Uurimisprobleem, lõputöö eesmärk, uurimisküsimused, hüpoteesid**

Lahendatava uurimisprobleemi, eesmärgi ja uurimisküsimuste määratlemise selgus, põhjendatus ja aktuaalsus. Eesmärgi ja uurimisküsimuste omavaheline seostatus. Probleemile vastavate ja selgete hüpoteeside olemasolu. Töö sisu kooskõla probleemi ja eesmärgiga. Töö ülesehituse loogilisus, liigendatus.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   |
| puudulik  | kasin  | rahuldav  | hea  | väga hea  | suurepärane  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Teoreetilised/empiirilised lähtekohad**

Valitud teoreetiliste lähenemiste vastavus ja sobivus uurimisprobleemi käsitlemiseks/lahendamiseks. Teoreetilise/empiirilise kirjanduse käsitluse piisavus uurimisprobleemi mõistmiseks ja avamiseks. Viidatud (erialaste) allikate piisavus, asjakohasus, ajakohasus ja allikate tõlgendamise korrektsus.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   |
| puudulik  | kasin  | rahuldav  | hea  | väga hea  | suurepärane  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Uurimismeetodid ja andmed**

Valitud kvantitatiivsete või kvalitatiivsete uurimismeetodite tutvustuse piisavus, selgus ning sobivus püstitatud eesmärgi saavutamiseks ning uurimisküsimustele vastamiseks. Andmekogumise meetodite asjakohane kasutamine. Empiirilise materjali/andmete/valimi vastavus ja piisavus uurimisprobleemi lahendamiseks, andmete usaldusväärsus.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   |
| puudulik  | kasin  | rahuldav  | hea  | väga hea  | suurepärane  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Uurimisprobleemi lahendamine/Uurimistöö analüütiline kvaliteet**

Analüüsi/arutluse kvaliteet: oskus andmeid analüüsida ning analüüsi tulemusi uurimistöö teoreetiliste/empiiriliste lähtekohtadega seostada. Töö tulemuste vastavus eesmärgile ja uurimisküsimustele: arutluse selgus, asjakohasus ja faktipõhisus; järelduste, ettepanekute ja soovituste seostatus läbiviidud uuringu ja teostatud analüüsiga; järelduste põhjendatus, õigsus ja loogilisus.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   |
| puudulik  | kasin  | rahuldav  | hea  | väga hea  | suurepärane  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Vormistamise kvaliteet**

Vormistuse vastavus kehtivatele nõuetele sh keelekasutus, viitamise korrektsus.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   | [ ]   |
| puudulik  | kasin  | rahuldav  | hea  | väga hea  | suurepärane  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Töö tugevused:**  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
|  |  |
| **Töö nõrkused:**  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
|  |  |
| **Küsimused:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1.2.3. |

 |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Retsensendi pakutav hinne:**

|  |
| --- |
| Hindamise skaala: 0 („F”) – „puudulik”; 1 („E”) – „kasin”; 2 („D”) – „rahuldav”; 3 („C”) – „hea”; 4 („B”) – „väga hea“; 5 („A”) – „suurepärane” |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Kuupäev:**  |  |

**Allkiri:**

## 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:**