

# Master's thesis assessment form for Social, Health & Organisational Psychology

---

**Credits: 15 ECTS**

**Name of student:** Antuan Broekman  
**Student number:** 3686914  
**First assessor/supervisor:** Dr. T. Frijns  
**Second assessor:** Dr. A. van der Weiden

## **Theoretical insight**

**assessment: 7,5**

(understanding of the problem definition, placing the research in literature, etc.)

Explanation: Antuan wished to explore social psychological processes among cross-fitters, and he dove enthusiastically into the literature and processed an impressive number of papers. His detailed grasp of a wide range of phenomena is impressive, though he struggles to establish a framework to organise his ideas into a coherent whole.

## **Research skills**

**assessment: 7,5**

(designing the study, carrying out the research, analysis of results)

Explanation: Antuan created a qualtrix survey, developed many of the questionnaires himself, gathered an impressive amount of participants, and analysed the data almost all by himself.

## **Work attitude**

**assessment: 7,5**

(how independent, enterprising, creative and problem-solving was the student; was there a process of development, did the student attain his/her planning)

Explanation: Antuan was very independent, enterprising and creative. The research topic and survey questionnaire were entirely of his own design. He showed progress in his writing and research skills throughout the process. He did not, however, always manage to stick to his planning.

## **Oral presentation**

**assessment: 7**

(in a final interview or final presentation)

## **The quality of the thesis report**

**assessment: 7**

(see criteria in Appendix 4)

Explanation: Antuan's writing in general is good, his English is excellent and he has a pleasant writing style. Coherence within paragraphs is good, but despite his best efforts, he does not achieve a clear overarching whole in his writing and fails to present a coherent picture. These difficulties stem at least in part from his unwillingness/inability to 'keep it small' and to focus on one or two core questions or

issues, which has led to the inclusion of a lot of variables in his study and thesis. Although I appreciate that this in turn stems from unbridled enthusiasm, curiosity and a desire to know everything there is to know about a topic, it still results in a thesis without a clear focus or message.

My main advice for future writing would be to 'kill your darlings' and focus on no more than one question or issue, thus allowing for a clearer thread and more in depth analysis.

Second grader's comments:

- The abstract is hard to follow. The constructs that are mentioned in the research design do not match the concepts that are mentioned in the results. The last sentence is too general.
- The introduction is well written and reflects clear knowledge of a range of psychological processes. However, I miss an argumentation of why and how motivation, social comparison, self-image, goal-setting, and identity (or social comparison, social identity, community and belonging – use of concepts is inconsistent) would be different for CrossFit than for 'general sports-populations'. What is the added value of the current research to theory and practice? The distinction between goals (what) and motivations (why) is confusing, as both examples concern motivations. What I miss most, is a connection between the different theories that are discussed and the present research question (e.g., CrossFitters show more intrinsic motivation, do you aim to replicate this finding, or how else is this relevant? Self-efficacy is important for goal-attainment, but how does this relate to CrossFitters and is it connected to intrinsic motivation?). The introduction now seems more like an enumeration of relevant psychological processes (while it is unclear why you chose these processes in particular), than a line of reasoning. Anyway, I have a hard time seeing the forest for the trees. The tying it together paragraph comes too late (clear connections should have been made throughout the text), and separately connects some of the processes, but I still don't see the bigger picture. Maybe it would also have helped to introduce (early on) a schematic model of how the concepts are interconnected and to explain what new insights can be derived from such a model.
- Was a power analysis performed to determine the required sample size? What is meant by alien gender? How was gender measured? And what theoretical reason do you have to exclude the participant with alien gender? In light of what hypothesis is body dissatisfaction measured? Can you explain/speculate why some of the Cronbach's alpha's are so low? Was there a debriefing? Otherwise, the measures are explained clearly.
- The ANOVA under the descriptive results was unexpected. What is the goal of this analysis? As for the confirmatory analyses, again, I find it hard to see the forest for the trees. Tables look good, but not all Figures conform APA.
- The discussion is a bit shallow. It is mostly a summary and interpretation of the findings, but does not really address how these findings contribute to science and/or society. Suggestions for future research could be more concrete, how would you set up this research, what would you expect, and what would this mean for theory and practice? And to what extent may the current findings be generalizable to other sports populations?
- The referencing format is not consistent.
- Overall, the amount of work done and literature read is impressive. However, my task is to judge only the thesis, which lacks depth and direction.

**Final assessment:**

**mark: 7**