



**Attachment 2.b.: Evaluation of the research plan**

The summary prepared based on the following template is the attachment of the opponent's review. If the student does not reach 60 points according to the template, then it is necessary to comment on the low scores.

| EVALUATION CRITERION   | SCORE<br>8-7  | SCORE<br>6-4                         | SCORE<br>3-1                               | SCORE<br>0                                | SCORE |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------|
| <b>1. Theoretical and/or practical relevance of the topic</b>  | particularly important  | important                            | less important                             | not relevant                              |       |
| <b>2. Revised national and international literature</b>  | very extensive  | extensive                            | exiguous                                   | unsatisfactory                            |       |
| <b>3. The dissertation's relation to the raised scientific questions</b>   | grasps them very well   | grasps them well                     | deals with them in a yet acceptable manner | deals with them in an unacceptable manner |       |
| <b>4. Developed framework of the analysis</b>  | is perfectly suitable for analyzing the problem, for answering the question | good                                 | acceptable                                 | bad                                       |       |
| <b>5. The conformity of the chosen research paradigm and methods with the research question and with the framework of the analysis</b> | completely coherent   | coherent                             | partly coherent                            | no conformity                             |       |
| <b>6. Expected results</b>   | much novelty  | novelty to be found in several parts | less novelty                               | known                                     |       |
| <b>7. References (APA)</b>   | correct, precise  | appropriate                          | acceptable                                 | unacceptable                              |       |
| <b>8. Feasibility of the research</b>  | completely feasible   | feasible with smaller risks          | very risky, less feasible                  | not feasible                              |       |

**EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY**  
**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY**  
**Doctoral School of Education**

1075 Budapest, Kazinczy u. 23–27. IV. em. 440  
 telefon: 461-4539, 461-4500/3863  
<http://www.ppk.elte.hu/nevtudphd/bemutakozas>



| EVALUATION CRITERION  | SCORE<br>5-4 | SCORE<br>3-2 | SCORE<br>1                     | SCORE<br>0     |  |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|
| <b>9. Construction and structure of the dissertation</b>              | excellent    | good         | acceptable                     | unsatisfactory |  |
| <b>10. Additional elements (illustrations, tables, glossary etc.)</b> | excellent    | good         | acceptable                     | unsatisfactory |  |
| <b>11. Style and terminological composition of the dissertation</b>   | excellent    | good         | acceptable                     | unsatisfactory |  |
| <b>12. Effectuation</b>   | excellent    | good         | acceptable                     | insufficient   |  |
| <b>Classification of the dissertation:</b>                            |              |              | <b>TOTAL SCORE (max. 100):</b> |                |  |
| 60 – 100 points <i>accepted</i>                                       |              |              |                                |                |  |
| 59 – 0 points <i>fail</i>   |              |              |                                |                |  |