

## TDK CONFERENCE EDUTUS 2023 SPRING SEMESTER

### Requirements of the thesis

The length of the institutional TDK thesis can be calculated including spaces and formatted into a minimum of **10** and a maximum of **25** pages, which is understood from the first page of the Introduction to the last page of the Summary. The thesis must be prepared in accordance with the requirements for scientific works. In the thesis, the obligatory reference form is the reference according to the Harvard system.

With the agreement of the professional committee, the organizing institution issues the thesis to two reviewers for evaluation. The evaluators comment and score the thesis based on the given evaluation criteria.

### Formal requirements

The thesis must be prepared on a computer using a text editor, in **Times New Roman** font, font size **12**, line spacing **1.5**. We ask the authors of the thesis to specify the date of closing the manuscript, by specifying the exact year, month and day, thus helping the fair evaluation.

### Outer cover

On the outer cover, in the middle, in the upper third, the title "**TDK thesis**" should be written in font size **14**. The author's name should be in the lower left corner, and if the thesis was written in BA training, the BA mark should be placed below the name (closed to the left), and the year (the year of the conference) at the bottom, center of the page, also in font size **14**. A template for the outer cover can be downloaded from the organizing institution's website.

### Inner cover

On the inside cover, please indicate the title of the thesis in **14** font size, in Hungarian and English, and at the bottom of the page the date of closing the manuscript as follows:

*e.g. Manuscript closing: 20xx. October 1*

### Structure of the thesis

The inside cover is followed by the summary in Hungarian and English prepared according to the summary document that is part of the thesis (which can be found later here below). This is followed by the table of contents, list of tables and figures, without pagination. The Introduction begins on the following page, with page number 1. The page number should be at the bottom of the page, in the middle. The margin on each side is **2.50-2.50** cm. The body of the thesis is followed by the Bibliography.

In the case of multi-authored works, the authors must indicate in the table of contents for each chapter which author(s) each chapter is the independent work of.

Appendices can be attached to the thesis, which must be placed after the bibliography. Tables, figures, and other documents may be included in the appendix that serve to illustrate the content of the thesis, but do not form a substantive part of the thesis.

Spelling, style and the above formal requirements are included in the assessment criteria. Regarding spelling, the latest publication of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences entitled "Rules of Hungarian Spelling" is the guide.

I. Guidelines for preparing the institutional TDK presentation

In the sections of the institutional TDK, students have 15 minutes to present the individual projects, during which time the research results and the content of the project must be presented in a free presentation.

The jury determines the order of the debates following the presentations.

II. Evaluation aspects of the TDK thesis

**TDK thesis Review**

Name of the student: .....

TDK thesis title: .....

- 1) The criticism can only be considered valid if supplemented with textual justifications (under the tables).
- 2) Each thesis is evaluated by two reviewers.
- 3) If the average of the two evaluations does not reach 24 points (40%), the thesis cannot be presented.
- 4) If there is a difference of 15 points or more between the two reviews, a third reviewer will be invited.

**1. Formal requirements (max. 6 points)**

Complies with professional expectations (e.g. scope, division, ratio of chapters, etc.)-----

---Inadequate

2            1            0            0

Figures and tables are formally complete-----

---Incomplete (e.g. source, unit of measurement, etc.)

2            1            0            0

Tastefully, carefully edited-----

---Sloppy work

2            1            0            0

Total score: .....

Written reasoning:

**2. Literature processing (max. 12 points)**

The number and variety of literature is adequate (domestic, international) -----Few

3            2            1            0

Accurate references in the text -----

---Missing, inaccurate references

3            2            1            0

Closely related to the topic, current -----

---Too general, outdated

3            2            1            0

Self-assessed -----Not self-assessed

3            2            1            0

Total score:.....

Written reasoning:

**3. Methodology: quality of data and information collection and processing (max. 12 points)**

Comprehensive independent data and information collection -----Incomplete / missing

3            2            1            0

The collected data and information are complete-----

---Incomplete

3            2            1            0

The chosen method is adapted to the objectives--

---The chosen method is not appropriate

3            2            1            0

High-quality, correct methodological application

---Low-quality, incorrect

3            2            1            0

Total score:...

Written reasoning :

**4. Results, conclusions, proposals (max. 12 points)**

Results are numerically and content-wise correct-----

---They are faulty and incorrect

3            2            1            0

Novel results and findings -----General findings

3            2            1            0

Derivation and presentation of results in an understandable way-----

---Confused frames

3            2            1            0

Conclusions and proposals are separate and correct - Incorrect or missing

3            2            1            0

Total score:.....

Written reasoning

**5. Overall evaluation, overall impression (max. 12 points)**

Formulation of specific objective(s)-----

---Absence of objective(s).

3            2            1            0

Consistency of objective(s), methodology,  
results, conclusions, proposals-----

---The lack of it

3            2            1            0

Professionally correct -----

---Professionally highly questionable

3            2            1            0

General comprehensibility, followability,  
language-----

---Difficult to understand, unclear

3            2            1            0

Total score:.....

Written reasoning:

**6. Evaluation of summary (max. 6 points)**

Asking research questions-----

---Absence of asking questions

2            1            0            0

Formulation of objective(s)-----

---Absence of objective(s).

2            1            0            0

Professionally correct summary-----

---Professionally highly questionable

2            1            0            0

Total score:...

Written reasoning:

TOTAL POINTS (max. 60 points):.....

Questions to be answered (optional):

Date:

III. The format of the summary that is part of the TDK thesis

Abstract (paper included)

(enter)

Áron Példa III. course (or year of degree )

Title in English

Title in Hungarian

(enter)

The resume should be prepared with **Microsoft Word** (version not older than 97), font type: **Times New Roman**, font size: **12**, justified, without word separation, with single space, **2** cm margin right and left, up and down, max. **2500** characters (with spaces) and maximum **one** page. Each paragraph is started at the beginning of the row. Please do not use any formatting in the resume!

The resume should meet the requirements of summaries of scientific papers (abstracts): cover the basic question of research, the objectives, methodology and the main conclusions

IV. TDK Presentation Assessment Scheme

Name of the student: .....

TDK thesis title: .....

Reviewer's name and position:.....

**1. Presentation method (max. 6 points)**

Attention-grabbing, articulate slides -----

---Poor / over-decorated; roughed up / overcrowded slides

3            2            1            0

The use of figures and tables is professional -----

---Not professional

3            2            1            0

Total score:.....

**2. Content level of the presentation (max. 20 points)**

Presentation of objective(s), methods in an understandable way -----

---Confused / incomplete description

4            3            2            1            0

Comprehensible derivation and presentation of result-----

---Difficult to follow, confusing

4            3            2            1            0

Presentation is professionally correct -----

---Not correct

4            3            2            1            0

Essential, logically structured presentation -----

---Weak structured, confusing presentation

4            3            2            1            0

Adequate professional vocabulary, correct use of technical terms-----

---Insufficient vocabulary, incorrect use

4            3            2            1            0

Total score:.....

**3. General evaluation (max. 14 points)**

The division of the presentation is proportionate (introduction, objective, methodology, results, conclusions, proposals)-----

---Disproportionate

3            2            1            0

Excellent performance -----

---Poor performance

3            2            1            0

Easy-to-understand, easy-to-follow presentation -

---Difficult to understand, unclear

3            2            1            0

Answers to questions are professionally correct -

---Professionally incorrect answers

3            2            1            0

Expertise in the subject and field is excellent ----

---Incomplete, inadequate

3            2            1            0

Total score: .....

TOTAL POINTS (max. 40 points):.....

Reviewer's signature