

Thesis Evaluation Form

By: _____ (ID.: _____)

Title: _____

Criterion	(0) Not met	(1) Partially met	(2) Met	Pts. (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2)
A Abstract				
Concise summary of central points	(0) Abstract missing or essential components (research question, method, results, conclusion) absent.	(1) Abstract present but incomplete or too general; not all key aspects clearly stated.	(2) Concise, complete summary of all core aspects; clearly and succinctly formulated.	
B Theory and Hypotheses				
Review of literature and presentation of the research question	(0) Literature has major deficiencies; predominantly non-academic sources; research question barely discernible.	(1) Relevant literature present, minor deficiencies; research question recognizable but not fully derived.	(2) Literature fully discussed; high-quality, current sources; research gap clearly shown; research question logically derived.	
Derivation and formulation of hypotheses	(0) No hypotheses formulated or not connected to the research question; key concepts not explained.	(1) Hypotheses present but not fully derived from literature or ambiguously formulated.	(2) Hypotheses precisely formulated and unambiguously derived from literature; key concepts and relationships thoroughly explained.	
C Methods				
Documentation of procedure and data collection	(0) No or insufficient description of sample, instruments, and procedure.	(1) Procedure described in broad strokes; information on sample and instruments present but incomplete.	(2) Procedure fully and clearly described (sample, instruments, procedure, quality criteria); precise.	
Illustration of the experimental procedure	(0) No or barely comprehensible overview; procedure not reproducible.	(1) Procedure basically recognizable; individual steps unclear or incompletely presented.	(2) Experimental procedure clear, complete and comprehensible; sufficient for replication, with figure if applicable.	
Analysis / Selection of statistical methods	(0) No or unsuitable methods selected; sample descriptive statistics largely missing; results formally incomplete.	(1) Adequate test selection, but descriptive statistics for sample description incomplete.	(2) Adequate methods correctly applied; sample description complete, formally error-free.	
D Results				
Description of results in relation to the research question	(0) Results barely related to hypotheses; no structure according to hypotheses.	(1) Results largely related to hypotheses; structure recognizable but not consistent.	(2) Results clearly and fully related to hypotheses; consistently structured according to hypotheses.	
Presentation of results (relevance, redundancy, clarity)	(0) Results unclear; tables/figures missing or copied directly from software; strong redundancy.	(1) Results basically presented; tables/figures present but not always clear; occasional redundancy.	(2) Results clear and appealing; tables/figures clear and understandable; no redundancy.	
E Discussion				
Evaluation and interpretation of results	(0) No or barely any interpretation; no reference to literature; erroneous causal conclusions.	(1) Interpretation present but not consistently supported by literature; summary not sufficiently differentiated.	(2) Differentiated, literature-based interpretation; further classification and transfer to related areas.	
Critical reflection on methods and the thesis	(0) No limitations stated; no self-critical examination.	(1) Some limitations mentioned but superficial; no concrete recommendations for future research.	(2) Critical and differentiated engagement with limitations; concrete recommendations for future research.	
Implications and outlook for further research	(0) No or barely any implications for theory or practice; no outlook.	(1) Some implications named; important aspects overlooked; conclusion not sufficiently differentiated.	(2) Comprehensive implications for theory and practice; specific conclusion that aptly summarizes the core of the thesis.	

Criterion	(0) Not met	(1) Partially met	(2) Met	Pts. (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2)
F Independence and Collaboration				
Own initiative in planning, execution, analysis, discussion	(0) Barely any own initiative; problems not solved independently; deadlines not met.	(1) Fundamentally independent work; own solutions attempted when difficulties arose; deadlines met.	(2) High initiative in all phases; own ideas contributed; deadlines reliably met; well-prepared meetings.	
Implementation of corrections and comments	(0) Feedback barely or not implemented; no recognizable further development.	(1) Feedback partially implemented; uneven quality of implementation.	(2) Feedback fully and reflectively implemented; active solicitation of feedback; visible further development.	
G Formal Correctness				
Structure, overall design and academic writing style, Citation style, reference list and figures	(0) Headings substantively incorrect; text components misplaced; non-academic style; spelling errors on many pages; citations not APA-compliant (e.g. footnotes, wrong order); figures unclear.	(1) Structure basically correct, individual sections should be reorganized; style mostly academic; APA style recognizable but with notable deviations; figures present but partially imprecise.	(2) Structure conforms to APA; all text components clearly assigned; consistently precise academic style; flawless spelling; largely error-free APA style; reference list complete; figures clear and concisely labelled.	

Grade scale		Total points _____ Rounded ($\geq .5$) _____ Grade _____
Points	Grade	
27 – 28	1,0	
25 – 26	1,3	
23 – 24	1,7	
21 – 22	2,0	
19 – 20	2,3	
18 – 19	2,7	
17	3,0	
16	3,3	
15	3,7	
14	4,0	
< 14	5,0 (failed)	

Comment (optional):

First examiner _____
Würzburg, _____

Grade: _____
Signature: _____

I concur with the first examiner's assessment.

(Second examiner's report only relevant for Master's thesis)

Second Examiner _____
Würzburg, _____

Grade: _____
Signature: _____