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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not Sufficient (1) | Satisfactory (2) | Good (3) | Excellent (4) |
| Abstract | Missing or too long or too short. Does not contain background, aim, results, or conclusion. | Contains background, aim, results, and conclusion. The different parts of the abstract may not be in proportion to each other. | Well written with relevant background, aim, results, conclusion, in proportion to each other. | Excellently written, clear and concise abstract with highly relevant background, aim, results, and conclusion, in proportion to each other. |
| Introduction/Background | Missing, too short or little or no relevance to the topic. No references or inadequate references. | Gives satisfactory perspective on the problem. Gives explanation of aim. Uses adequate references. | Gives a good perspective on the problem on a national or international level. Gives good explanation of why the aim is important to study. Uses relevant references. | Gives clear perspective on the problem on a national and international level. What is known and what is unknown. Clearly states why the aim is important to study. Uses highly relevant references. |
| Aim | Missing or not relevant to the topic or inadequately formulated. | Satisfactorily formulated aim relevant to the topic. | Well-stated aim, relevant to topic. | Clearly stated aim, highly relevant to the topic. Well suited for the course. |
| Methods | Not suited or poorly suited for testing the hypothesis or not described or poorly described. Not applicable or poorly used method. No references or inadequate references. Descriptions of statistical methods is missing or only mentioning which program was used. For qualitative projects, analysis poorly described or analysis not applicable for method. | Adequately suited and applicable for testing the hypothesis and adequately described with adequate references. Method well applied. Statistical program stated, statistical methods used are mentioned and correct. For qualitative projects, method and analysis adequately described analysis applicable for method.  | Well suited and applicable. Well described with appropriate references. Appropriate and well applied method for testing the hypothesis. Statistical program stated. Statistical methods used are well described and correct. For qualitative projects, method and analysis well described. Analysis well applied for the method.  | Well suited and clearly described with correct references. Correct and very well applied method for testing the hypothesis in the chosen material. Clearly applicable. Statistical program and version stated and referenced. Correct statistical method used and clearly described with references. For qualitative projects, method and analysis well suited and correctly presented. Analysis very well applied for the method.  |
| Evaluation/Results | Results not satisfactory related to aim or mostly missing. Tables or figures with faults or missing. For qualitative projects, quotes are missing. | Too many or too few results presented, not clear which are the main ones. Tables or figures contains relevant characteristics of the study. For qualitative projects, too many or too few quotes presented. | Results based on the aim are presented. Adequately structured. Tables and figures contain relevant characteristics of the study. Main results highlighted in table or figure. For qualitative projects, quotes adequately presented. | Main results based on the aim are clearly presented. Clearly structured. Tables and figures contain relevant characteristics of the study. Main results highlighted in table or figure. Missing data clearly indicated. Flow chart presented when appropriate. For qualitative projects, quotes clearly presented with a good structure. |
| Discussion | Not relevant to the study or poorly structured. No connection to the results. No connection to other research. Strength and weaknesses of the study are not mentioned. | Satisfactory discussion of results and the strength and weaknesses of the study. | Well written discussion of main results in relation to aim. Most of the study’s strength and weakness are discussed. Well structured. | Very well written discussion of main results in relation to aim. Strength and weaknesses and potential bias are discussed and put into a new perspective. Excellent structure.  |
| Conclusion | Missing or not satisfactorily related to results or not relevant to aim. | States some findings but not all or not main findings. | States main findings. Well formulated. | States main findings and its implications in a short- and long-term perspective. Very well formulated. |
| References, APA format, Spelling, Syntax | Disorganized with greater than six grammatical and spelling errors. Does not reflect a high level of professionalism. Does not utilize APA format. References missing or irrelevant. | Organized, clear with 4 – 6 spelling and grammatical errors. Reflects high professionalism. Utilizes APA format with 4 - 6 errors. References mostly adequate and in the correct order. | Organized, clear with 1 - 3 spelling and grammatical errors. Reflects high professionalism. Utilizes APA format with 1 – 3 errors. References in the correct order and the same APA format. | Clearly organized, thorough, and free of grammatical and spelling errors. Reflects the highest level of professionalism. Utilizes APA format throughout. References relevant to topic, skillfully referred to in the text. All references in the correct order and the same APA format.  |
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