A

Student Name:		Student Number:	
First Marker's Mark: 48	Second Marker's Mark: 45		Agreed Final Mark: 46
Name and Signature of First Marker: Turnitin report checked? Yes		Name and signature of Second Marker:	

GENERAL COMMENTS ON DISSERTATION OVERALL AND RECONCILIATION OF 1ST and 2ND MARKERS

INTRODUCTION, CONTEXT, RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	MARKS (10%)
MARKING CRITERIA • Is the research topic or problem clearly stated and shown to be worth investigating? • Has appropriate background information been provided with special terms and concepts defined? • Are the research objectives (research questions or hypotheses) clear, relevant, coherent and achievable? • Do objectives etc. go beyond mere description ie. Do they involve explanation, comparison, criticism or evaluation?	60 (6)

COMMENTS

This had the making of being an interesting Dissertation topic, but your introduction could have been more focused. You have quite a lengthy piece that draws on Hofstede's perspective on culture, but you then do not link this to your discussion about how this might influence a firm's HRD approach.

There are some themes mentioned in your introduction (p16) where you refer to issues of 'equality and the fair management of diversity', but then you do not develop these later in your Dissertation

Address
This iss

LITERATURE REVIEW	MARKS (25%)
MARKING CRITERIA	40 (10)

- Has a comprehensive range of RELEVANT literature been used to discuss relevant concepts, models and theories? - Are the sources used up to date, and of sufficient academic weight? - Does the dissertation give evidence of a critical attitude towards source material? - Are the key themes and issues surrounding the research questions clearly drawn from the literature? - Have sources been acknowledged and referenced fairly and properly? Is the bibliography at the end of the dissertation complete and in the Harvard style?	

COMMENTS

As your Dissertation was based on an investigation into the HRD approach within an organization in Qatar, I would have expected to see you draw on the International HRM literature, particularly convergence/divergence debates. You could have then linked this to your literature on national culture, which you cover in reasonable detail in your introduction.

It is not quite clear why you have only focused mainly on the Purcell et al. People and Performance model. This doesn't seem to have informed the questions asked in your interviews.

Many of your other literature sources are quite old too.

A critique of the limitations of the Talent Management concept in the Qatar National context would have also added to this section.

Not really addressed still a 1st of this

Too much of Culte study national later in this section etc

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	MARKS (15%)
MARKING CRITERIA - Is there a clear rationale for the research design and methodology? - Are the research methods fully described and the advantages and disadvantages of chosen methods discussed? - Are any constraints or limitations identified? - Are the relevant research instruments (eg. blank questionnaire, interview questions etc) included in the appendices? Are the research instruments well designed with all questions etc. relevant to research objectives? - Are sampling methods described in detail? ie. who the respondents are, how many there are and how they were selected? - Are data analysis methods discussed? - Is there evidence of care and accuracy in the data collection process? Are reliability and validity issues addressed? - Has the methodology been critically evaluated in retrospect?	40 (6)

COMMENTS

Overall this chapter reads like an essay on research methodology. Given that you indicate that your research philosophy is interpretivism, it is not clear why you have then gone into a lengthy discussion about sampling. What is missing is detail about: why you wanted to investigate HRD practices in a particular organization in Qatar; how you negotiated access; how you conducted the interviews (were they face-to-face, did you record), as well as justification for why so few interviews. You mention on p29 that interesting in gathering employee perceptions – yet the people you have interviewed are in managerial roles.

Questions in the blank interview schedule do not reflect the actual questions asked in each of the 4 interviews. There seem to be a lot of questions asked in the interviews which do not relate to the high level research questions. There are very limited question of actual HRM/HRD policies, which is meant to be the main focus of the Dissertation.

No interview schedule

Extensive section on Method sampling — but then you ignore in actual research

RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF FINDINGS	MARKS (30%)
MARKING CRITERIA • Is all data presented relevant to aims and objectives? • Is the analysis thorough and appropriate to the data collected? eg. FOR QUESTIONNAIRES Do the appendices contain a data matrix, and details of statistical analysis undertaken? Is statistical analysis correctly performed and interpreted? FOR INTERVIEWS, FOCUS GROUPS etc Do the appendices contain data collected and analysed such as interview transcripts? Has qualitative data been systematically analysed? FOR DOCUMENT, ARCHIVE AND OTHER SECONDARY SOURCES. Has the validity and reliability of the sources been addressed? Has quantitative or qualitative data been systematically analysed? • Are the findings presented clearly and interestingly for the reader, with useful tables and charts embedded in the text and with the appendices being used appropriately for bulky and/or less interesting/essential data? • Have the findings been discussed and evaluated? • Have the finding of the primary research been compared and contrasted with findings, theories, models and concepts derived from the literature review?	**40 (12)**

This section is much improved - although - with actual number of interviews - little depth of response

COMMENTS

The findings section needed to be organized in a way that makes it easier for the reader to pull out the key points. Your data table should have been

included as an Appendix – as there is too much information to have in this format in your findings. Once this is stripped out, there is very little data in your findings.

There is no attempt to analyse your findings in relation to the main HRM model (Purcell et al.), that you drew on in your literature review.

There are some really interesting points in your interview transcripts, but you have not drawn these out in your findings section.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	MARKS (10%)
MARKING CRITERIA • **Have the research objectives (research questions) been reviewed and addressed?** • **Do the conclusions and recommendations follow on from the findings? Are they well grounded in the evidence and arguments presented?** • **Has the relevance of the conclusions for management been discussed?** • **Are the conclusions and recommendations discussed in context and are they more widely applicable?**	**50 (5)**

COMMENTS

As an MBA Dissertation I would have expected this section to take more of a broader strategic perspective. For example consider the extent to which firms are able to influence government policy on wider education, training and development provision to meet the Qatar 2030 National Vision.

Some of you points do not flow from your findings (p50) – where you refer to employing younger workers, or appointing more local nationals into senior roles. You also seem to be making sweeping generalizations (p51) that are not supported with your data.

PRESENTATION, STRUCTURE AND WRITING	MARKS (10%)
MARKING CRITERIA • **Is the overall style and presentation of the dissertation in accordance with that specified in the Module Handbook ie. Cover pages, title page, word count, spacing, chapter and section headings, pagination, appropriate font, bolding, italics** • **Is the title concise and appropriate?** • **Is the abstract a concise (1 page) summary of the main aims, methodology, findings and conclusions?** • **Are acknowledgements made as appropriate?** • **Is the contents page clear, concise and logically numbered? Are appendices, tables and figures numbered**	**60 (6)**

and listed in the contents page? • Are all appendices referred to in the text? • Is the writing clear and in an appropriate academic style? • Is the standard of written English acceptable? Has the dissertation been spelling and grammar checked?	

COMMENTS

Overall your Dissertation is well presented and written, with correct referencing. You needed to provide an Abstract, not an Executive Summary.