

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:

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 research area/s been demarcated meaningfully and appropriately?				
Comments:				

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

3. Literature survey/handling of source material	1	2	3	4
Does the work adequately reflect that the candidate has an acceptable level of knowledge of the relevant and suitably recent				

literature in the field?				
Is the mentioned knowledge applied and integrated into the study suitably – argumentative, critical, and integrated?				
Comments:				

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

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

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

7. Problem-solving/achievement of aims	1	2	3	4
Does the candidate come to an acceptable solution of the problem stated at the outset?				
Have the aims been achieved satisfactorily?				

Are the deductions, conclusions and generalizations logically justified ?				
Are the candidate's findings important?				
Comments:				

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

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

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

Recapitulatory comments:

--

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

Mark awarded [in the case of a mini-dissertation or dissertation]:	
---	--

Concluding recommendation [mark one]:

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

SIGNATURE OF EXAMINER

DATE