

# Assessment Form Master Thesis

Name of the student:

First name

SURNAME

Student registration no.

Name of the supervisor:

First name

SURNAME

***Title of the thesis:***

Total points scored:                  out of 100

Grading:

- ≤50.0 points – Fail
- >50.0 points – 62.5 points Sufficient
- >62.5 points – 75.0 points Satisfactory
- >75.0 points – 87.5 points Good
- >87.5 points – 100.0 points Very good

Grade: Please choose an element

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature of the supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

## Criteria for approvability of the master thesis

If at least one knock-out criterion applies, the thesis cannot be approved.

### Authenticity

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The authenticity of the thesis could be established.</b>	
If any of the following knock-out criteria apply, please tick!	Please justify your knock-out choice(s).
<input type="checkbox"/> The independent nature of this academic work could not be plausibly demonstrated by the student in the coordination meetings held according to point 9 of the Master Thesis Guideline. <sup>1</sup>	
<input type="checkbox"/> There are indications of ghost-writing including undocumented use of artificial intelligence.	
<input type="checkbox"/> A detailed plagiarism check in terms of formal and content criteria has been made. There is proof of plagiarism.	
<input type="checkbox"/> There is another violation of good academic practice according to ÖAWI guidelines.	
<input type="checkbox"/> References used are not accessible.	
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear which parts were copied directly or indirectly.	

### Formal aspects

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The thesis has no formal deficiencies.</b>	
If any of the following knock-out criteria apply, please tick!	Please justify your knock-out choice(s).
<input type="checkbox"/> The scope does not meet the requirements.	

<sup>1</sup> The student must arrange these face-to-face coordination meetings. If these talks have not taken place at all or not as often as required (three times), the knock-out criterion of authenticity has not been met.

<input type="checkbox"/> Required components are missing.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grammar, spelling, style, structure, and presentation do not meet the minimal requirements of academic writing.	

### Ethical aspects

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The thesis meets ethical requirements.</b>	
If any of the following knock-out criteria apply, please tick!	Please justify your knock-out choice(s).
<input type="checkbox"/> The aspects of data protection and third-party rights have not been considered.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The guidelines for gender and diversity sensitive language and image use were not followed.	

### Assessment criteria

This section must be completed if the thesis is approvable (no knock-out criterion).

#### 1. Formal aspects (10 points max.):

points

Please justify any deduction of points

<b>1.1 Language use and presentation</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Spelling and syntactic rules in the chosen language are adhered to.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Structure, outline, layout, and visualisation are appropriate.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Figures and tables are used judiciously and referenced in the body of the text.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Correct documentation of AI tools and other aids used in the thesis (e.g. SPSS and SAS).	

<b>1.2 Sources, citation, and bibliography</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The thesis is fundamentally based on primary scientific literature.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The relevant terms are defined and either documented with a source or clearly marked as self-definition.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The selection of sources is suitable for embedding the argumentation of the thesis in the current discussion or for checking its validity and completeness.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The citation style conforms to recognised citation guidelines and is used throughout.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The bibliography is complete and contains only the sources cited in the text.	

**2. Structure and content (60 points max.):**

points

Please justify any deduction of points

<b>2.1 Aim and research question</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Research question and aim of the thesis are clearly delineated.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The choice of research question is presented in a comprehensible manner.	

<b>2.2 Relevance and level of innovation</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The topic is of high scientific and/or practical relevance while avoiding trivialities.	

<input type="checkbox"/> The topic is highly innovative.	
----------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>2.3 Argument, „common theme“</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The arguments are presented coherently and free of false arguments and redundancies according to the rules of scientific rigour.	

<b>2.4 Research status</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Relevant theoretical principles are presented concisely and correctly.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The current state of research regarding the objective of the thesis is presented concisely.	

<b>2.5 Interpretation of the results, conclusion &amp; outlook</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Regarding the thesis objective, established and acquired knowledge is brought together.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Assumptions and limitations of the thesis are presented.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Objectives and results are concisely formulated in a summary and relevant derivations and, where appropriate, recommendations for action are presented.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The research question(s) has (have) been answered. An outlook on further research has been given.	

<b>2.6 Independent nature of academic work</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Academic work in this thesis is sufficiently independent (in this point, qualitative authenticity is assessed if it is found to be above the level of the knock-out criterion). The thesis is considered to be based on independent research as it attempts to answer a research question designed independently by choosing and applying a certain method, and independently interpreting the findings made.	

**3. Methodology (30 points max.):**      points

<b>3.1 Methodology, presentation &amp; evaluation of the results</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The methodology is presented transparently, its selection appropriately justified, critically reflected, and correctly conducted according to the standards of the discipline and suitable to answer the research question.	
<input type="checkbox"/> The logical conclusions from the data analysis are presented in a comprehensible manner.	

**Notes:**

--

## Assessment overview:

	Points achieved	Maximum points
Formal aspects		10
Structure and content		60
Methodology		30
<b>Total points:</b>		<b>100</b>