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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FORMAL ASPECTS** | **POINT** |
| 1. **STRUCTURE** (The proportion of chapters and units, the logical proportioning of main- and subchapters) |  |
| The proportion of chapters and units is ideal, the proportioning of main- and subchapters is clear and impeccably logical. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The proportion of chapters and units is acceptable, however somewhat questionable. The proportioning of main- and subchapters is not always clear and somewhat logically questionable. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The proportion of chapters and units is usually questionable. The proportioning of main- and subchapters is typically unclear and logically questionable. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The chapters and units are entirely disproportional. The proportioning of main- and subchapters is entirely unclear and inconsequent. | **0** |
| 1. **CITATION, BIBLIOGRAPHY, APPENDIX** (The correctness of cited work; consistency with the APA standards; formal consistency in the citation and bibliography; correspondence of the appendix and the main topic of the thesis; manageability of appendix.) |  |
| The content of cited work is impeccably correct. The citations and bibliography are consistent (following the APA standards) and formally correct. The appendix is easily manageable and correspondent with the main topic of the thesis. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The content of cited work is somewhat incorrect. The citations and bibliography are somewhat inconsistent (following the APA standards) and formally incorrect. The appendix is somewhat hard to manage and not correspondent with the main topic of the thesis. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The content of cited work is often incorrect. The citations and bibliography are often inconsistent (following the APA standards) and formally questionable in several aspects. The appendix is hard to manage and not correspondent with the main topic of the thesis. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The content of cited work is typically incorrect. The citations and bibliography are entirely inconsistent and formally inadequate. The appendix is unmanageable and not correspondent with the main topic of the thesis. | **0** |
| 1. **STYLE, TERMINOLOGY** (Appropriateness and fluency of language; adequate terminology regarding the conventions of the field of study) |  |
| The language is impeccably appropriate and fluent, the style is adequate, professional and meets the criteria of the conventions of the field of study. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The language is somewhat inappropriate, sometimes not fluent. Style is somewhat colloquial, and terminology generally meets the criteria of the conventions of the field of study. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The language is typically inappropriate, generally not fluent. Style is mostly colloquial, and terminology mostly does not meet the criteria of the conventions of the field of study. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The language is entirely inappropriate and not fluent. Style is colloquial, and terminology does not meet the criteria of the conventions of the field of study. | **0** |
| 1. **HIPOTHESIS** (Elaboration and composition of hypothesis; its consistency with the main theoretical chapter) |  |
| The hypothesis is fully elaborate, unequivocally following from the theoretical scope, and clearly defined. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The hypothesis is not entirely elaborate, not clearly following from the theoretical scope, and unclearly defined. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The hypothesis is not elaborate, only partly following from the theoretical scope, and unclearly defined. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The hypothesis is not elaborate, not following from the theoretical scope, inaccurate and unclearly defined. | **0** |
| 1. **PRESENTATION OF THEORETICAL BACKGROUND** (knowledge of theoretical background, choice of literature, summary of literature, highlighting the main aspects) |  |
| Knowledge of theories is thorough, the selection of literature is adequate, the theories are linked in a logical way. The phenomena and terms relevant from the research’s point of view are adequately stressed. | **6** |
|  |  |
| Knowledge of theories is somewhat questionable, the selection of literature is partly adequate, the theories are sometimes linked in a questionably logical way. The phenomena and terms relevant from the research’s point of view are not consistently stressed. | **4** |
|  |  |
| Knowledge of theories is questionable, the selection of literature is inadequate, the theories are linked in a questionably logical way. The phenomena and terms relevant from the research’s point of view are not satisfyingly stressed. | **2** |
|  |  |
| Knowledge of theories is entirely questionable, the selection of literature is hardly at all adequate, the theories are not linked to each other. The phenomena and terms relevant from the research’s point of view are strongly missing. | **0** |
| 1. **METHOD** (Sampling and its characterization, operationalization of the research variables, the choice and description of measurement tools, the presentation of the method.) |  |
| The sample and its characterization are adequate, the choice of used methods is sufficient, the method/experimental setting is beyond exception and its presentation is accurate and easy to follow. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The sample and its characterization are not consistently adequate, the choice of used methods is questionable, the method/experimental setting is somewhat exceptionable, and its presentation is insufficient but easy to follow. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The sample and its characterization are overall inadequate, the choice of used methods is questionable, the method/experimental setting is exceptionable, and its presentation is insufficient and hard to follow. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The sample and its characterization are inadequate, the choice of used methods is inadequate, the method/experimental setting is entirely exceptionable and its presentation is insufficient and very hard to follow. | **0** |
| 1. **STATISTICS** (The appliance and presentation of appropriate statistics for the hypothesis. |  |
| The applied statistical analysis is adequate, its knowledge is accurate. The presentation of the results follows the scientific criteria and the appropriate indicators are not missing. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The applied statistical analysis is not consistently adequate, its knowledge is somewhat inaccurate. The presentation of the results does not always follow the scientific criteria and the appropriate indicators are sometimes missing. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The applied statistical analysis is overall inadequate, its knowledge is in many cases inaccurate. The presentation of the results does not follow the scientific criteria and the appropriate indicators are usually missing. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The applied statistical analysis is entirely inadequate. The statistical analysis is inappropriate, and the presentation of the results does not follow the scientific criteria. The appropriate indicators are missing. | **0** |
| 1. **RESULTS** (Interpretation of the statistical results) |  |
| Interpretation of the statistical analysis is adequate and fully follows the numerical results. | **6** |
|  |  |
| Interpretation of the statistical analysis is only partly adequate and in cases does not follow the numerical results. | **4** |
|  |  |
| Interpretation of the statistical analysis is mostly inadequate and, in many cases, does not follow the numerical results. | **2** |
|  |  |
| Interpretation of the statistical analysis is entirely inadequate and does not follow the numerical results. | **0** |
| 1. **DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION** (Interpretations, correspondences, referring to the theoretical introduction, alternative explanations - if necessary) |  |
| The interpretations are adequate, there are references to the theoretical introduction, the author sees the adequate correspondences of the results and finds alternative interpretations if necessary. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The interpretations are mostly adequate, there are some references to the theoretical introduction, the author sometimes sees inadequate correspondences of the results. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The interpretations are partly adequate, there are few references to the theoretical introduction, the author often sees inadequate correspondences of the results. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The interpretations are inadequate, there are barely references to the theoretical introduction, the author does not see the correspondences of the results. | **0** |
| 1. **GENERAL IMPRESSION** (General aspect of the thesis, coherence, informative merit. General impression of the author’s knowledge.) |  |
| The whole thesis has an excellent general aspect, it is entirely coherent, informative and an enjoyable reading. The author convincingly demonstrates his/her knowledge and own opinions, interpretations. | **6** |
|  |  |
| The whole thesis has an adequate general aspect, it is mainly coherent, and a mainly informative reading. The author sometimes unconvincingly demonstrates his/her knowledge and own opinions, interpretations. | **4** |
|  |  |
| The whole thesis has a problematic general aspect, it is often incoherent, and only partly an informative reading. In many cases, the author unconvincingly demonstrates his/her knowledge and own opinions, interpretations. | **2** |
|  |  |
| The whole thesis has a strongly problematic general aspect, it is almost entirely incoherent, and almost entirely an uninformative reading. The author unconvincingly demonstrates his/her knowledge and own opinions, interpretations. | **0** |
| **TOTAL** | **60/** |
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