



Universität
Zürich^{UZH}

Chair of Organization and Management



Criteria for the Evaluation of Scientific Papers

Prof. David Seidl, PhD



Structure

- Does the paper have a meaningful and comprehensible chapter structure in terms of content?
- Is a logical, progressive common thread recognizable in the overall structure?
- Are all directories/indexes that are relevant and formally required for the paper included?
- Does the paper exhibit an appropriate and balanced content weighting of the individual chapters relative to the topic?

Introduction

- Is the introduction to the topic successful, and does it arouse the readers' interest?
- Is the scientific relevance of the chosen topic presented conclusively?
- Is the central problem of the paper clearly identified and delimited?
- Is the actual research question formulated precisely and unambiguously?
- Does the author outline the specific research contribution the paper aims to make?

Theoretical Foundation

— Fits of the concepts used to the topic

- Have the concepts applied in the paper been chosen appropriately and purposefully for the specific topic?
- Have suitable and well-founded theories, concepts, and phenomena been selected to scientifically analyze the problem?
- Does the literature consulted and discussed contribute significantly and appropriately to answering the research question?

— Theoretical breadth

- Does the paper consider the most important and relevant strands of literature in the context of its thematic orientation?
- Are various theoretical perspectives and approaches adequately illuminated and included in the scientific discourse?
- Does the theoretical foundation rely comprehensively on the central and fundamental sources of the respective discipline?

— Theoretical depth

- Is the referenced specialized literature not just examined superficially, but presented in detail and well-founded within the overall scientific context?
- Are the theoretical relationships relevant to the topic and the research question analyzed in depth and clearly elaborated?

Methodology (for empirical theses)

— **Quality and suitability of the data**

- Do the collected data have the necessary scope and quality for meaningful results?
- Are the data suitable for soundly answering the research question?
- Has a sufficient amount of data been collected for meaningful findings (usually 5 interviews for a Bachelor's thesis, 10 for a Master's thesis)?

— **Fit of the method**

- Is the chosen research design suitable for answering the research question?
- Are the data collection methods appropriately chosen for the specific topic of the paper?
- Is the applied analysis method suitable for obtaining reliable results from the collected data?

— **Analysis and evaluation**

- Is the entire analysis process methodically, transparently documented and clearly comprehensible for the readers?
- Does the evaluation of the collected data reach an appropriate analytical depth, rather than remaining purely descriptive and superficial?
- Is the interpretation of the obtained data carried out in a structured, methodologically guided, and systematic manner, and are the empirical results discussed and linked with theory?

Methodology (for conceptual theses)

— Literature base

- Was the selection of relevant specialized literature carried out in a systematic and methodologically sound manner?
- Is the procedure for the literature search and subsequent selection of sources transparently and understandably documented for the readers?

— Conceptual approach

- Is the chosen methodological or conceptual approach fundamentally suitable to achieve the set goals of the work?
- Does the specific conceptual approach prove to be targeted and methodologically appropriate for soundly answering the formulated research question?

— Synthesis and development

- Is the referenced specialized literature not only presented in isolation but systematically and fruitfully linked together?
- Does the paper succeed in independently developing new and relevant connections based on the analyzed foundations?
- Does the theoretical examination of the topic lead to the elaboration of a distinct, coherent conceptual model?

Scientific Quality

— Independent contribution

- Does the author engage deeply and critically with the specialized literature used, rather than just stringing sources together without comment?
- Are theoretical models and relationships independently developed, placed in a new context, and soundly interpreted?
- Are (practice-relevant) conclusions and well-founded recommendations for action independently derived from the findings?

— Stringency

- Is the content-related argumentation consistently coherent, valid, and free of contradictions in content?
- Are the central research question, the theoretical foundations, the continuous argumentation, and the final conclusions brought into alignment systematically and without contradiction?

— Derivation and evidence of statements

- Are the central statements and theses of the work developed logically and transparently for the readers?
- Are the claims made supported by appropriate and valid scientific sources?
- Are theoretical arguments conclusively supported by suitable empirical data?

Conclusion (for empirical theses)

— Discussion

- Are the obtained research results soundly and conclusively integrated into the existing theoretical context?
- Are comprehensible theoretical and practice-relevant implications derived from the insights gained?
- Is there an in-depth, objective, and critical reflection on one's own results and the research process?

— Conclusion

- Are the central results and core statements of the paper summarized concisely and purposefully?
- Are the methodological or content-related limits of the own investigation presented comprehensively and transparently?
- Does the paper offer a well-founded and logical outlook on further, future fields of research?
- Does the paper conclude with a clear, comprehensible, and well-rounded overall summary?

Conclusion (for conceptual theses)

- Are the central core statements of the paper summarized concisely and clearly?
- Are comprehensible theoretical and practical implications derived from the insights gained?
- Is there a transparent and critical examination of the methodological and content-related limitations of the paper?
- Is a well-founded and logical outlook provided for further, future research questions?

Sources

- Are the sources used up to date with the latest scientific research?
- Do the cited literature sources comply with common scientific citation standards (e.g., APA)?
- Is the research based on a diverse and broad (international) selection of sources?
- Is the amount of literature used appropriate and suitable for the respective research question?
 - Guideline: Bachelor's theses 20 (empirical) to 30 (conceptual), Master's theses 30 (empirical) to 40 (conceptual)
- Is the citation method correct (clear recognizability of adopted vs. own ideas, completeness of information for the individual sources)?
- Is the citation method adequate (avoiding unnecessary citation, appropriate extent of verbatim quoting, avoiding mere compilation)?

Language

- Does the paper follow standard German/English rules for spelling, grammar, and punctuation?
- Does the linguistic tone of the work remain objective, neutral, and free of evaluative or emotional coloring?
- Are the formulated sentences and technical terms chosen accurately, distinctly, and unambiguously?
- Are the sentence connections linguistically and logically correct?
- Do the sentence sequences seamlessly reflect the thought processes adequate for the objective of the investigation?
- Is the argumentation free of illogical cognitive breaks and unnecessary repetitions of content?
- Are the content-related transitions between individual chapters designed to be logical and fluent (e.g., summaries or outlooks)?

AI Usage

- Does the scientific paper remain a clear reflection of the student's own intellectual achievement despite the use of AI?
- Have all AI-generated contents been critically reviewed, fully understood, and can they be explained by the student?
- Does the AI under no circumstances replace the student's own literature research and critical source evaluation?
- Was it avoided to upload confidential or personal data (e.g., interview transcripts) into AI tools without explicit permission?
- Was the use of AI disclosed transparently and formally correctly (prompt log)?
- Does the report show a critical examination of the opportunities, risks, and limitations of the tools? (Appendix: AI USE COMMENTARY)
- Were the AI results correctly referenced according to APA standards (or other agreed-upon standards)?

See: Chair of Organization and Management: [Guidelines for the usage of Artificial Intelligence](#)

Format

- Does the entire paper exhibit consistently uniform, visually appealing, and reader-friendly formatting?
- Are all relevant lists and overviews (table of contents, abbreviations, figures, tables, references, ...) included?
- Does the formal appearance of the paper consistently correspond to a uniform and professional scientific layout?
- Are the included figures and tables relevant to the content-related argumentation, and do they offer added value?
- Are all graphical elements provided with correct, complete, and consistently uniform labeling?
- Are figures and tables sensibly integrated into the running text, and are they explicitly referenced?