MBA. DISSERTATION MARKING PRO FORMA

Student Name:		Student Number:	
First Marker's Mark: 58	**Second Marker's Mark:** 60		**Agreed Final Mark:** 60%
Name and Signature of First Marker:		**Name and signature of Second Marker:**	

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

Generally a good piece of work.
Ambitions methodological approach.
lacks full explanation of approach.

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?	6

COMMENTS

The importance of this research is clearly delineated, the problem is set out below lucid fashion. Suitable background information is provided and the research methodology is explained more than adequately. In setting out the objectives the candidate could have been a little more analytical and critical. In places, it is a little too descriptive.

LITERATURE REVIEW	MARKS (25%)
MARKING CRITERIA • 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?	**16**

COMMENTS

a very and interesting account of the literature on the subject. Unfortunately, a critical attitude is lacking. More could have been made to critique and assess the literature. The candidate does however do a good job in presenting the key themes and issues on this body of work. The sources have been properly acknowledged, referencing is good and the bibliography is also thoroughly referenced.

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?	**9**

COMMENTS

The candidate should be commended for undertaking a very ambitious methodology. Unfortunately, supporting explanations for the methodology are lacking, and it is rather difficult to follow exactly what the candidate is reporting. Nonetheless, the candidate does show where willingness to attempt sophisticated methodological approaches.

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?	**15**

COMMENTS
The candidate adopted a sophisticated methodology. The reporting is adequate for the most part although it would have benefited from a more comprehensive approach to reporting on the findings: greater explanation was needed. There is considerable over emphasis given to issues of validity and reliability and too little given to explaining the

actual findings, especially when it comes to reporting on significant statistical relationships. This is rather inadequate and the findings are not properly discussed or debated. Overall, more could have been done.

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?	6

COMMENTS
The conclusions and recommendations are adequately dealt with. More could have been done to link the objectives and the findings. It is a little too brief and rather too descriptive.

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 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?	6