

Grading System of the Master in Current Democracies: Nationalism, Federalism and Multiculturalism

The following table details the general criteria that underpin different bands of marks for the assessment of Master theses used by the supervisors of the Master in Current Democracies. Note that this list is merely orientative and not exhaustive. In addition it is not applied by the “tribunal de trabajos de fin de máster”.

Mark Range		Key features applicable in the assessment of Master thesis
9-10	<i>Analysis</i>	Outstanding answer: exceptionally well structured and theoretically informed, showing striking personal insight and originality.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Authoritative; full understanding of relevant material; highly original analysis; highly independent and critical judgment; high degree of precision.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Unusually extensive range of sources, applied with outstanding insight; exceptionally effective use of evidence to support argument.
	<i>Structure</i>	Superb structure, focus, presentation and writing style, contributing to a highly compelling argument.
8-9	<i>Analysis</i>	Excellent answer informed by wider reading, showing clarity of thought, personal insight and originality.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Thorough understanding of relevant material; insightful discussion; evidence of independent and critical judgment.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Extensive range of sources applied insightfully; very effective use of evidence to support argument.
	<i>Structure</i>	Excellent structure and focus; clear and fluent writing style; compelling argument.
7-8	<i>Analysis</i>	Thoughtful answer informed by wider reading, showing clarity of thought and personal insight.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Thorough understanding of relevant material; insightful discussion and analysis.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Extensive range of sources applied insightfully. Effective use of evidence to support argument
	<i>Structure</i>	Well structured and focused; clear and fluent writing style; persuasive argument.
6-7	<i>Analysis</i>	Good understanding or relevant material; coherent and logical argument.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Good understanding of important facts and concepts; substantive analysis of key issues.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Good use of relevant sources/literature; employment of a range of evidence to support argument.
	<i>Structure</i>	Coherent and logical presentation.
5-6	<i>Analysis</i>	Sound understanding; limited analysis.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Generally sound understanding of relevant material but limited range or depth; more descriptive than analytical.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Appropriate but limited use of sources/literature; attempts to support argument, but these are awkward and/or unconvincing.
	<i>Structure</i>	Generally clear presentation but awkward structure and/or limited development of argument.
4-5	<i>Analysis</i>	Basic understanding and analysis.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Some general knowledge but little detail; minimal demonstration of analytical thought.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Sparse coverage of basic material; generally unsuccessful in using evidence to support argument.
	<i>Structure</i>	Adequate structure and presentation, but unclear or disorganized in places.
0-3	<i>Analysis</i>	Unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate.
	<i>Understanding</i>	Little or no knowledge demonstrated; numerous inaccuracies; meaning unclear; little or no analysis.
	<i>Comprehension</i>	Inappropriate and/or inaccurate use of sources/literature; poor or no use of evidence to support argument.
	<i>Structure</i>	Disorganised and unclear presentation; consistently poor spelling and grammar; incoherent argument or none discernible; unacceptably brief.