

Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology Department Psychology

**Review of the Master's Thesis in the Master's Program Social, Cognitive and Affective
Neurosciences (SCAN) by Mr. /Ms.**

With the title:

Nature of the work: Empirical work Theoretical work

In case of a teamwork: Written together with (First Name, Last Name):

1. *Summary and Conclusion*

Preliminary Note: The following template is not suitable for all Master's Theses. Its use is entirely optional. We suggest to use following partial evaluations for the individual sections as "Grades" following the overall grade template:

1 = Excellent (*summa cum laude*), 2 = very good (*magna cum laude*), 3 = good (*cum laude*), 4 = satisfactory (rite), 5 = poor (unsatisfactory), n.a. = not applicable.

The partial evaluations are for your guidance. They are meant for the combined overall grade and should not be used for its "calculation". There should be a recognizable connection between the partial evaluations and the overall grade you give; if not, please give a brief explanation. Given the diversity of topics, it might occur that individual sub sections only play a minor role in the evaluation of this specific research. Nevertheless, please give an assessment.

2. Objectives, theoretical background, issue/hypotheses

- | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2.1. Presentation of the work's objectives..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 2.2. Presentation of the theoretical background..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 2.3. Research results gained..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 2.4. Derivation of the issue/hypotheses..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |

3. Methods

- | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 3.1. Operationalization of the variable..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 3.2. Adequacy of the research plan..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 3.3. Description of the data collection..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 3.4. Selection and size of the sample..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 3.5. Description of the sample..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |

4. Results

- | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4.1. Structure and classification of presented results..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 4.2. Precision of the presented results..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 4.3. Explanation of the evaluation procedures..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 4.4. Adequacy of the evaluation procedures..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |

5. Discussion

- | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 5.1. Short comprehensible presentation of the main results..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 5.2. How are results classified in literature?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 5.3. Presentation of the implications of the results..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |
| 5.4. Critical reflection on the research..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> n.a. |

6. General aspects

- 6.1. Structure and outline..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.2. Clarity and intelligibility..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.3. Illustration (Tables and charts)..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.4. Scope of the included literature..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.5. Adequacy of the literature cited..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.6. Correctness of the exterior appearance..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 6.7. Compliance with the formal requirements of DGPS/APA..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.

7. Independent work

- 7.1. Independence and activity in planning..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 7.2. Independent implementation..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 7.3. Independent evaluation..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 7.4. Independent drafting of the work 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.

8. Is the work fit for publication?

- 8.1. Chances to be published..... 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 8.2. Readability/understandability of the manuscript 1 2 3 4 5 n.a.
- 8.3. Publication has already been..... submitted revised accepted n.a.

Rating: The rating of the work (valid points are only 1.0 , 1.3 , 1.7 , 2.0 , 2.3 , 2.7 , 3.0 , 3.3 , 3.7 , 4.0 , 5.0) reflects the individual evaluations. The emphasis the reviewer lays on such individual evaluations may vary when determining the rating in order to take into account the specific characteristics of each work.

Berlin, date

Stamp and signature (Primary Reviewer)

Berlin, date

Stamp and signature (Second reviewer)