Guidelines on the valuation of scientific elaborations

The following guidelines apply to all scientific final papers (diploma, bachelor or master theses), essays as well as practical experience reports in the study programs of faculty 3: Business and Law of Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences. They have been determined by the faculty council of faculty 3: Business and Law on June 21, 2006.

1 Competency goals of scientific elaborations

The bachelor/master thesis is supposed to demonstrate that the student is able to autonomously apply scientific methods within a defined period and solve problems in new and unfamiliar fields on the basis of thorough and specialized knowledge in their field of study. (§ 24 Abs. 1 i. V. m. § 3 Abs. 2 und 3 AB Bachelor/Master).

These competency goals apply to essays which are more narrowly defined as well as practical experience reports in the respective study programs.

1.1 Valuation standard

The valuation of scientific elaborations is based on contentual and formal criteria.

1.2 Criteria of contentual valuation

1.2.1 Task assignment

Was the task understood? Have all essential aspects been covered? Is the overall context of the subject clear? What is the importance of the subject to the state of advancement in the department?

1.2.2 Thematic delimitation

Has the author made a suitable thematic delimitation? Have important aspects been lost in the process? Is a possible reduction to certain main aspects well justified? Are the working hypotheses reasonable? Do all treated aspects belong to the *topical setting*?

1.2.3 Quality of source research and use

Were *qualitatively appropriate* sources used to an *adequate* extent? Was international literature also evaluated to an appropriate extent? Were the sources *correctly evaluated*, *correctly cited* and also *understood*? Was there a *critical evaluation* of the sources? Does the evaluation of the sources show sufficient topicality?

1.2.4 Solution approach, methodology

What methodological skills does the author demonstrate in forming a solution approach? Are different methods discussed and compared? Is the choice of a particular method justified? Is the chosen method applied confidently? How was the topic dealt with (empirically/theoretically, by reference/comparison/evaluation (e.g. literature work), own investigations/surveys, experimental approach)?

How broadly and profoundly was the topic treated, how high is the *informational content*?

How pronounced is the *realization of the practical relevance*? Were usable findings developed that can be realized in practice?

Have *chains of argumentation and evidence* been developed that are well-founded and thus free of pure allegations, conjecture, speculation and contradictions?

Are *calculations* made mathematically correct and self-designed *drawings* DIN-compliant?

1.2.5 Approach, structure

Is the structure of the processing logical and balanced? Are individual aspects given too little attention? Does the elaboration correspond to the given topic, the own introduction? Are there any imbalances between outline and presentation? Is the argumentation complete, objective and factually correct? Is the thread of the presentation recognizable through a logical and convincing *line of thought* and through a structured and clear layout?

1.2.6 Autonomy

Are independent working hypotheses developed? Are more difficult single issues also dealt with? How extensive is the topic dealt with? Is there ingenuity and depth of thought? Is there an ability to problematize and critique? Are independent evaluations developed?

1.2.7 Quality of results

To what extent are these new findings? Are they sufficiently substantiated, proven, are they representatively measured, reliable? Do they represent a factual advance in the field of the task? Are the results of the paper summarized in an appealing and appropriate form?

1.3 Criteria of formal valuation

1.3.1 Linguistic competence and style

Is the terminology technically correct and the linguistic expression scientifically appropriate (or colloquial/artificial), clear and accurate? Are sentence structure, spelling and punctuation correct? Is comprehensibility supported by meaningful examples, illustrations, illustrative graphics and informative tables? Are the topics presented formulated *comprehensibly* and *logically*? Are sentence links *linguistically* and *logically correct*? Do the sequences of sentences reflect *adequate thought processes of the topic* in a seamless form?

1.3.2 Presentation

Is the outline adhered to? Is a consistent classification and an appropriate depth of outline realized? Is the scientific quality of illustrations, graphs, tables, etc. given, which must be technically clean, legible without any doubt, correctly numbered and their designation must unambiguously reflect the content? Does the citation style comply with scientific standards? In particular, are all sources used in the text cited completely and correctly in the bibliography? Is the chosen citation style followed through consistently and correctly? Is readability/clarity supported by a well-structured scientific apparatus? Are the respective "Guidelines for the design of final papers" followed? Does the typeface/layout correspond to today's standard (PC word processing)?