Evaluation grid Bachelor thesis Business, Economics and Social Sciences

WU WIRTSCHAFTS UNIVERSITÄT WIEN VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

Last name, first name(s):   Student ID no: Study Code:

Please just select category "1. exceeds expectations" if the criteria from columns 2 and 1 are met.

Competence 1: The students are able to identify a relevant problem/aim/working assumption.

The student is able to	Not relevant for this thesis	4. Does not meet expectations	3. Meets expectations partly	2. Meets expectations	1. Exceeds expectations
1a define the problem/aim/working assumption.		● unable to identify a problem/aim/working assumption ● unable to define the problem/aim/working assumption ● relevance is not shown	● problem/aim/working assumption is identified but vague ● relevance is not clearly shown/incomprehensively	● clearly identifies and defines problem/aim/working assumption ● proposed problem is relevant	● clearly identifies and defines a problem/aim/working assumption and shows awareness of other related problems ● a clear focus is defined ● the problem's relevance is shown clearly
1b explain the relevance of the problem.		● unable to explain the relevance of the problem ● unable to use relevant academic literature to situate/explain/describe the problem	● explains the relevance of the problem but relations to extant literature are unclear ● academic literature is partly used but important academic findings are missing	● explains the relevance of the problem, relations to extant literature are addressed ● academic literature is mostly used and important academic findings are mentioned	● explains the relevance of the problem, references to existing literature become clear ● uses relevant academic findings to support academic discourse
1c contextualize the problem in the academic discourse and/or relate to current and relevant academic literature.		● unable to contextualize the problem in the academic discourse ● unable to use academic literature	● contextualizes the problem in the academic discourse but contextualization is not coherent ● academic literature is partly used but important academic findings are missing	● contextualizes the problem in the academic discourse and contextualization is clear and coherent ● academic literature is mostly used and important academic findings are mentioned	● contextualizes the problem in the academic discourse and contextualization is clear and coherent ● uses relevant academic findings to support academic discourse ● uses state-of-the-art literature in the field
1d outline a (relevant) theoretical framework for the problem.		● unable to outline a relevant theoretical framework ● unable to summarize relevant literature	● outlines a theoretical framework but description is incoherent and/or lacks in detail ● outlines a theoretical framework but relevance but relevance is not clear	● outlines and describes a relevant theoretical framework ● relevant literature is summarized ● relevance to the problem is explained	● clearly outlines and consistently describes a relevant theoretical framework ● relevance to the problem is clearly and coherently explained and discussed

Competence 2: The students are able to analyze a relevant problem.

The student is able to	Not relevant for this thesis	4. Does not meet expectations	3. Meets expectations partly	2. Meets expectations	1. Exceeds expectations
2a select and describe an appropriate research design.		● results can not be obtained with selected design ● unable to explain use of methodology ● selected methods/tools/theories are inappropriate ● design is unclear ● problems using standard methods	● results can be obtained with selected design ● selected methods/tools/theories are described but not in detail ● selects methods/tools/theories which seem adequate to solve the problem ● design needs more distinctiveness ● applies some standard methods	● methods/tools/theories are described thoroughly ● design can be understood properly ● selected methods/tools/theories are appropriate to solve the problem ● applies standard methods	● design selected in a well-founded manner ● methods/tools/theories are described thoroughly to replicate the results ● describes limitations of the developed design ● applies advanced methods/tools and/or complex theories
2b link the design to the (theoretical) framework.		● unable to connect the design with theoretical viewpoints ● demonstrates lack of knowledge in subject matter ● relevant aspects are missing ● important theoretical approaches are missing	● a connection between the design and the relevant theory is visible but it is only loosely linked ● some associations seem far-fetched	● the connection between the design and the relevant theory is clearly established ● able to connect some important aspects but lacks perspective to apply them thoroughly	● establishes new and original links between selected design and theoretical viewpoints ● different theoretical approaches are compared to each other and linked to the design

The student is able to	Not relevant for this thesis	4. Does not meet expectations	3. Meets expectations partly	2. Meets expectations	1. Exceeds expectations
2c comprehensively and coherently describe how the results were obtained.		● unable to describe and explain how the results were obtained ● no description of how the results were obtained	● the approach is described but not in detail/not comprehensively ● approach is not properly explained ● it is partly described, how the results were obtained ● some steps of the result query are missing	● approach is described ● approach can be understood properly ● it is clearly and comprehensively described how the results were obtained ● all important steps are mentioned	● clearly discloses how the results were obtained ● approach is accurately and consistently described
2d draw a (comprehensible) discussion and conclusion from results.		● discussion and conclusion are not comprehensible and/or unconvincing ● discussion and conclusion have not been linked to the addressed problem nor to the results	● conclusions are drawn in a rudimentary form ● some conclusions seem far-fetched but a discussion with some impact is visible ● implications of the results and major limitations have not been discussed sufficiently	● clear links are drawn between the discussion, the conclusion and the problem addressed ● discussion and conclusions are clearly based on the results ● implications of the results and major limitations have been discussed sufficiently	● in discussing the results in the context of the addressed problem, new perspectives including implications are introduced ● puts conclusions into a wider context ● limitations have been clearly acknowledged
2e identify and obtain the relevant empirical data to solve the problem.		● unable to identify the relevant data ● demonstrates lack of knowledge of useful data sources	● partly unable to identify the relevant data ● partly shows lack of knowledge of useful data sources	● able to identify the relevant data with some minor deficiencies ● shows good but not perfect knowledge of useful data sources	● perfectly able to identify the relevant data ● demonstrates knowledge of useful data sources
2f structure the empirical analysis in accordance with the intended research design.		● incorrectly uses obtained data ● unable to obtain sample data that are free from selection biases ● unable to differentiate between correlation and causality	● the data obtained is sometimes used incorrectly ● partly unable to obtain sample data that are free from selection biases ● sometimes unable to distinguish between correlation and causality	● uses the obtained data without error ● uses data that is mostly free from selection bias ● distinguishes well but not perfectly between correlation and causality	● uses the obtained data without error ● uses data that is free from selection bias ● perfectly differentiates between correlation and causality
2g apply the methods for the interpretation of legislation.		● unable to correctly use methods	● methods are used but in a wrong way	● sufficient understanding and mostly correct use of the relevant methodology	● full understanding and correct use of the relevant methodology

Competence 3: The students are able to demonstrate academic writing skills.

The student is able to	Not relevant for this thesis	4. Does not meet expectations	3. Meets expectations partly	2. Meets expectations	1. Exceeds expectations
3a use correct language and orthography.		● serious mistakes in grammar ● misleading wording ● a lack of coherence impairs understanding ● inadequate language skills	● mostly correct use of grammar ● not consistently comprehensible ● linguistic expressiveness not consistently satisfying	● correct use of grammar ● understandable wording and phrasing ● adequate linguistic expressiveness	● coherent syntactical structures ● excellent linguistic expressiveness ● sentence structure supports readability
3b develop a clear and consistent structure (introduction, main part, conclusion).		● structure is confusing or inconsistent ● unable to present a central theme ● some central chapters are missing (abstract, index, bibliography…)	● develops a structure of introduction, main part and conclusion ● structure is not fully comprehensible ● most of the required chapters are included (abstract, index, bibliography…)	● develops a clear and consistent structure of introduction, main part and conclusion ● structure mostly provides clear orientation ● all required chapters are included (abstract, index, bibliography…)	● coherent structur ● line of argumentation is visible through the structure
3c apply citations/references in a systematic manner according to guidelines.		● insufficient use of a citation/referencing system and style ● arguments are insufficiently supported by appropriate sources	● consistent use of a citation/referencing system and style but there are formal mistakes ● references are regularly incomplete ● sources of arguments are not sufficiently clear	● citation/ reference system and style applied correctly ● references are complete ● sources of arguments are given throughout	● excellent use of citation and reference system/style ● sources of arguments are always appropriate and transparent
3d use technical terminology correctly and appropriately.		● misuse of technical terms	● mostly correct use of technical terms but a some inconsistencies in their use	● technical terms are consistently used in the right context ● relevant technical terms are defined	● the relevant technical terms are used and defined correctly and discussed critically

3e independently organize and implement individual work steps.		• no independence, extensive support required • no time management • no independent planning and organization of the research process • submitting poor work to most deadlines and not preparing for meetings • supervisor's feedback not or insufficiently incorporated	• some independence, support required • time management available for individual work steps • individual work steps of the research process is organized independently • submitting mediocre work to deadlines and is poorly prepared for meetings • supervisor's feedback partially taken into account or incorporated	• independent implementation and good initiative • good time management • independent planning of the work steps of the research process • submitting good work to deadlines and preparing well for meetings • supervisor's feedback considered and sensibly incorporated	• reflected independent implementation and initiative • very well structured time management • well thought-out and independent planning of the work steps of the research process • submitting very good work to deadlines and is very well prepared for meetings • supervisor's feedback reflected and refuted or sensibly incorporated

Competence 4: The students are able to demonstrate computational skills.

The student is able to	Not relevant for the thesis	4. Does not meet expectations	3. Meets expectations partly	2. Meets expectations	1. Exceeds expectations
4a master the software tools they use.		• insufficient ability to effectively use the software tools employed	• partial ability to effectively use the software tools employed	• some but not perfect proficiency in handling the software tools employed	• perfect proficiency in handling the software tools employed
4b structure and document the code/spreadsheet.		• written code/spreadsheet is insufficiently structured • code/spreadsheet is insufficiently documented	• written code/spreadsheet is basic structured • code/spreadsheet is partly insufficiently documented	• written code/spreadsheet is well-structured but not perfect • code/spreadsheet is well-documented but not perfect	• written code/spreadsheet is perfectly structured • code/spreadsheet is perfectly documented
4c search for literature both online and offline.		• insufficient (re-)search in the relevant online/offline media	• is able to find literature but insufficiently	• a substantial amount of the most relevant literature was used	• almost all the relevant literature was used

Examiner**:**   *name written out in block printing & signature*

Date:

Institute stamp