

## **Grading criteria**

### **Very good (1.0-1.3): an excellent performance**

- Original, independent research question
- Demonstrates ability to make independent, reasoned judgments and displays high competence in analytical thinking.
- Clear argumentation and reflective-critical approach to the chosen topic
- Linguistically at a high level: precise and comprehensible expression, excellent handling of the literature used
- Formal requirements for good scientific work are met: good handling of references, bibliography, headings, citations, etc.
- In case of theses (1.0): worthy of publication

### **Good (1.7-2.3): performance that is significantly above average requirements.**

- Clear research question
- Good approach to independent scientific work and reasoned judgment
- Largely clear argumentation and reflective-critical handling of the chosen topic
- Linguistically on a high level: precise and comprehensible expression, above-average handling of the literature used
- Formal requirements for good scientific work are met: good handling of references, bibliography, headings, citations, etc.
- Minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the structure of the work occur

### **Satisfactory (2.7- 3.3): a performance that meets average requirements**

- Unclear or unproductive questioning
- An attempt has been made to formulate an argument that displays a reflective approach to the chosen topic, but there are some major weaknesses or gaps
- Linguistically at an acceptable level: mostly comprehensible explanation of ideas as they relate to the thesis; the handling of the literature used is fair
- Formal requirements for good scientific work are largely fulfilled
- Major inaccuracies or gaps in the argumentation and/or incoherencies in the structure of the paper are present

**Sufficient (3.7-4.0): a performance which, despite its deficiencies, still meets the requirements**

- No recognizable, comprehensible questioning
- Evidence of a basic attempt to formulate an argumentation on the chosen topic, but obvious weakness, gaps, or inaccuracies present
- Linguistically at a below-average level: mistakes in the way of expression, often the reference to the thesis or research question and the way literature is used is difficult to understand
- Formal requirements for good scientific work are partly not fulfilled: incorrect handling of references, bibliography, headings, citations, etc.
- Crude or obvious inaccuracies, gaps in the argumentation or incoherencies in the structure of the paper are present

**Insufficient (5.0): a performance that no longer meets the requirements due to significant deficiencies**

- No questioning and insufficient or no recognizable argumentation
- Linguistically on a far below average level: errors in expression, often the reference to the thesis, and the used literature is incomprehensible
- Formal requirements for good scientific work are not fulfilled: incorrect handling of references, bibliography, headings, citations, etc.
- Crude or obvious inaccuracies, gaps in the argumentation or incoherencies in the structure of the work
- Plagiarism or attempted deception will also result in a grade of 5.0