



## Dissertation Assessment

Title of the work:

**Preliminary remarks:**

The document is not suitable for all types of courses. Its use is entirely optional.

**The component assessments of the individual sections are meant to be used only for the purpose of orientation for arriving at your total final mark and not actually for "calculating" it.**

**After completing the form, please print it out and sign, stamp and fax it to (+49-30) 450-576910.**

Name of the doctoral candidate:

<b>0</b>	<b>FOR PUBLICATION PROMOTION</b>	
		Space for comments
0	Does the presented thesis taking into account own portion of the doing a doctorate person show a total of one doctorate-worthy achievement?	

<b>A</b>	<b>STRUCTURE AND FORM OF THE WORK</b>	
		<b>Your assessment</b> (0: excellent... Space for comments 4: unsatisfactory)
1	How well is the work structured?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
2	How good is the linguistic standard?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
3	How good is the graphic work (texts, graphics, tables)?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

<b>B</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES OF THE WORK</b>	
4	How good is the introduction to the research problem area?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
5	How well are the research questions defined?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

<b>C METHODS</b>			
6	How well are the methods described?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
7	How well are the criteria for evaluating variables defined?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
8	How good are the control groups (in terms of quality and quantity)?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
9	How well are the methods suited for answering the questions raised?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
10	How high is the precision of the methods?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
11	How good is the random sample selection (distorting factors)?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
12	How well does the size of the random sample correspond to the questions raised?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	


<b>D RESULTS</b>			
13	How well are the results described?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
14	How good is the statistical analysis?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
16	How understandable are the results?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	

<b>E DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS</b>			
16	How well is the method discussed?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
17	How well are the results discussed?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
18	How well are the results compared with the literature?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
19	How clear are the conclusions reached?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
20	How well are the conclusions underpinned by the results?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	

<b>F LITERATURE</b>			
21	How comprehensive is the cited literature?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
22	How relevant is the cited literature?	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	

<b>G ORIGINALITY / COMPLEXITY</b>			
23	Assessment of scientific originality	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
24	complexity/standard of the methodology	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	
25	Effort	0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4	


**Overall assessment/suggestions for revision, if necessary:  
PLEASE DOUBLECLICK and overwrite or write as an attachment**



**Your assessment (please cross applicable item(s)):**

- No mark**, revision required, resubmission to my office.
  - See mark below, but revision required before printing, no resubmission to my office.
  
- Summa cum laude (excellent, 0):**  
Carried out independently, the work is excellent in terms of methodology and form and of high scientific research value.
  
- Magna cum laude (very good, 1):**  
Carried out independently, the work is very good in terms of methodology and form and of considerable scientific research value.
  
- Cum laude (good, 2):**  
Carried out independently, the work is good in terms of methodology and form and of scientific research value.
  
- Rite (satisfactory, 3):**  
Carried out independently, the work is satisfactory in terms of methodology and form and of scientific research value.
  
- Non sufficit (unsatisfactory, 4):**  
All work that fails to meet the „rite“ criteria.

Assessor's stamp:



Assessor's signature