



## Faculty of Theology

### EXAMINER'S REPORT

Mini-dissertation + modules [papers]		Weight : Mini-dissertation		Weight : modules [papers]	
Dissertation + modules [papers]		Weight : Dissertation		Weight : modules [papers]	
Thesis + module [paper]		Weight : Thesis		Weight : module [paper]	
Dissertation only					
Thesis only					

Surname and initials of candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Qualification: \_\_\_\_\_

Surname and initials of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

*Column 1: excellent [75%+]*  
*Column 2: very good [65% - 74%]*  
*Column 3: satisfactory [50% - 64%]*  
*Column 4: totally inadequate [less than 50%]*

1. Research-worthiness of the theme	1	2	3	4
Has the <b>research area/s</b> been demarcated meaningfully and appropriately?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

2. Problem statement and aim/objectives	1	2	3	4
Has the <b>problem statement</b> been formulated clearly?				
Have the <b>aim and objectives</b> been stated clearly and adequately and are they feasible?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

3. Literature survey/handling of source material	1	2	3	4

Does the work adequately reflect that the candidate has an <b>acceptable level of knowledge</b> of the <b>relevant and suitably recent literature</b> in the field?				
Is the mentioned knowledge applied and integrated into the study suitably – <b>argumentative, critical, and integrated?</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				

<b>4. Central theoretical argument</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Is the <b>Central theoretical argument clear and verifiable?</b>				
<b>Comments:</b>				

5. Research methods/techniques; choice and application	1	2	3	4
Are the <b>research methods/techniques</b> appropriate?				
Does the candidate <b>handle</b> them <b>appropriately</b> ?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

6. Logical structure/line of argumentation	1	2	3	4
Is the work <b>systematic, logical, well-structured, balanced</b> and <b>clear</b> regarding the total setup of the study?				
Are the <b>arguments deployed and sustained clearly</b> from the <b>problem statement</b> through to the <b>conclusions</b> ?				
Are the <b>chapters logical steps in the line of argumentation</b> ?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

7. Problem-solving/achievement of aims	1	2	3	4
Does the candidate come to an <b>acceptable solution of the problem stated at the outset</b> ?				
Have the <b>aims</b> been achieved satisfactorily?				
Are the <b>deductions, conclusions</b> and <b>generalizations logically justified</b> ?				
Are the candidate's <b>findings</b> important?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

8. Documentation/language usage/technical finish	1	2	3	4
Has the work been <b>documented</b> acceptably [use of references, tables, figures, footnotes, illustrations, list of references]?				
Is the work on par with reference to <b>language usage</b> ?				
Is the <b>stylistic and technical finish</b> in order [title page, table of contents, appendices, summary and bibliography, quality of typography and binding]?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

9. Original contribution of the work [especially in the case of a thesis]	1	2	3	4
Is the <b>contribution</b> important, relevant?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

10. Publishability of [sections of] the work	1	2	3	4
Can the work (or sections thereof) be <b>published</b> ?				
<b>Comments:</b>				

Recapitulatory comments:

--

***The mark awarded to the dissertation/mini-dissertation does not need to be an arithmetical average of the evaluation of the different subsections***

<b>Mark awarded [in the case of a mini-dissertation or dissertation]:</b>	
---	--

**Concluding recommendation [mark one]:**

1. Accept with no adjustments	
2. Accept, but request smaller adjustments	
3. Refer back for revision and re-submission	
4. Reject the mini-dissertation / dissertation/thesis	

---

**SIGNATURE OF EXAMINER**

---

**DATE**