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**Part 2 – 8000 word dissertation – TURNIT IN**

**In submitting work for marking the student guarantees it is their work, is original, authentic, fairly and correctly sourced and is plagiarism free. Contravening these rules may result in penalties recording a mark of zero. Students are allowed to resubmit their work before the assessment deadline to address any issues arising from the Turnitin similarity report.**

**DISSERTATION STRUCTURE**

The dissertation will normally have the following parts:

* Title Page
* Acknowledgements
* Abstract
* Contents Page
* Introduction
* Literature Review
* Methodology and data collection, including research objectives/hypotheses
* Results/Findings
* Analysis/Evaluation of Results/Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* References
* Appendices

**NOTES ON EACH SECTION**

Title Page

This should be centred on the page with the main title in upper case. Any longer sub-title should be in lower case. Put your student number to the bottom right. [The reports should be anonymous].

Acknowledgements

These are not essential but can be useful for recording organisational help.

Abstract

This is a brief statement of what the dissertation contains. It should have a statement of what you set out to do, what you did, what you concluded and what you recommended. Busy managers often only read the title and abstract of a report so it is a key part of your work. You cannot write the abstract until all the work is finished.

Contents page

This should be your table of contents showing the section titles and the subsections (indented) against page numbers. As in the text, the former can be underlined and in bold.

Introduction

Briefly give a background to your dissertation, why the topic is of importance to others and why it is of interest to you. Make a clear statement of your headline research question or hypothesis or argument and the type of research methodology you propose to carry out.

Literature review

Write a review of the main body of published work. This acts to set out your project in the context of existing knowledge. It is therefore your main evidence of secondary research effort. It should show how much theory you go into and from where your research questions or hypotheses were developed.

Look for gaps in the knowledge which your research may fill, or you may wish to replicate or amend someone else’s research for the purposes of comparison. The Literature review provides a critical insight, especially to a new reader, into current thinking around your topic of interest. You need to demonstrate a broad range of references majoring on academic articles (journals). These sources may also be supported by textbooks, web references, newspapers and professional magazines.

Methodology

This section should provide sufficient detail about the methodology or methodologies you employed for an outsider to replicate the study exactly. You need to justify the methodology you use by demonstrating the particular benefits of qualitative or quantitative approaches in the context of your research objectives or hypotheses. If you used triangulation, report it and state the rationale for using it. You should also report on the characteristics of the research respondents in the case of qualitative research e.g. job position, years in service for example, also stating why these are important to providing information which address your research questions/hypotheses. If you use quantitative research, state the type of sampling you used e.g. convenience, cluster quota for example and again provide your rationale. Remember random sampling means statistically defined sampling which may be beyond your resources. Also provide detail on which data analysis package you used.

Results and Findings

This section should include the results of your analysis. Even when you have used secondary data for your dissertation, you will still need to present and analyse these data and generate new findings.

For qualitative research, you need to report on the content analysis of your transcripts, pulling out the key themes and sometimes including quotations from your interviewees. However, ensure the quotations don’t rule the roost! Your findings will address your research objectives and perhaps also include some emerging areas that developed out of your interviews.

For quantitative research, ensure your findings reflect the objectives/hypotheses also. The data needs to be presented clearly with a title to each table/chart and then a small amount of commentary for non-numerical readers! If you use comparative statistics e.g. chi-square, t-tests or ANOVA, ensure you state the level of significance, normally 0.05.

Analysis/Evaluation of Results/Findings

In this section you will need to make sense of the overall findings presented in your previous chapter. Interpret the data critically. You can do this by: drawing together specific themes; making comparisons with similar research, as well linking and integrating with the literature that you have referred to earlier in your Dissertation. Other aspects to consider are: to what extent have you provided some answers to your questions, how generalisable are the answers to other organisations/populations and what are the implications for business practice? Be self-critical about any shortcomings you may have about your chosen methodology e.g. sampling, breadth and depth of findings, validity and reliability issues.

Conclusion

The section summarizes the relationships between your findings and the existing body of knowledge. You need to summarise the key points of your research and demonstrate how they addressed the research objectives/hypotheses. If appropriate, suggest further research in the area but avoid introducing new material as this would be a new finding.

Recommendations

Whilst the conclusions are driven by your findings, your recommendations for practice may reflect your own opinions on for instance what the organisation should do next or how the findings should be embedded in organisational practice.

References (not included in the word count)

References provide details of the reading materials you used and noted in the text of your dissertation. A quick guide to tutors for the potential quality of a dissertation is to look first at the references to see how extensive the list is. The list needs to be in alphabetical order and follow the Harvard system of referencing.

Appendices

Appendices should contain any material too detailed to go into the main text, for instance a copy of the questionnaire (for survey studies, keep all the completed questionnaires as evidence in case you are asked to substantiate claims of conducting the survey). Also use an appendix for your interview guide, sample of transcripts, visual material used in interviews as well as copies of any correspondence to the organisation where your research investigation took place.
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| **SUPERVISOR SUPPORT QUESTIONS TOWARDS ASSESSEMENT:**  **Title of dissertation** | **Student Name and number** |
| **INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES (10%)**  \*is the topic clearly stated and defined with a clear purpose?  \*are the aims and objectives (or research questions) clear, relevant and coherent?  \*if a hypothesis is identified, is it a proper testable hypothesis?  \*are the aims and objectives achievable? | COMMENTS |
| **LITERATURE REVIEW (20%)**  \*has a comprehensive range of relevant literature been used?  \*are the sources up to date and of sufficient academic weight?  \*does the dissertation give evidence of a critical attitude towards source material?  \*have the sources been acknowledged and referenced properly? Is the bibliography complete and in the Harvard style? | COMMENTS |
| **METHODOLOGY (20%)**  \*is there a clear rationale for methodology?  \*have the advantages and disadvantages of the chosen methods been discussed?  \*is the research methodology described fully? Could it be replicated?  \*are relevant research instruments eg blank and completed questionnaires  \*are the sampling methods described in detail i.e.  \*who are the respondents, how many and how selected?  \*are data analysis methods discussed egg content analysis, descriptive statistics, correlation, tests of significance  \*have the ethical issues been addressed? | COMMENTS |
| **RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION (30%)**  \*is the analysis appropriate to the data collected?  \****FOR QUESTIONNAIRES***  \*how clearly presented are the data? Are details of the statistical analyses provided? Does the chosen statistical analysis make the most of the data?  \****FOR INTERVIEWS***  \*are the interview transcripts included in the appendices? Is there evidence that the data have been systematically analysed? Is there a summary of key points?  \*are the key themes and issues discussed  \*are links drawn with both the research objectives and the literature review | COMMENTS |
| **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (10%)**  \*do the conclusions follow on from the findings?  \*are the conclusions well grounded in the evidence?  \*are the recommendations plausible given the research findings? | COMMENTS |
| **OVERALL STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (10%)**  \*is the overall style and presentation in accordance with that specified in the Module Handbook e.g. word count, spacing, section headings, Harvard style of references, font size  \*is the abstract a concise summary of the main aims, methodology, findings and conclusions?  \*does the dissertation read as an academic piece of work? | COMMENTS |

**Assessment Grid**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Assessment category and its contribution to the overall mark.*** | **90-100** | **80-89** | **70-79** | **60-69** | **50-59** | **40-49** | **30-39** | **20-29** | **0-19** |
| **Objectives and research question**  **10%** | Impressive and highly original research question. Flawless rationale. | Excellent and original research question for which compelling rationale is provided and objectives clearly enable to address it. | Good and original research question for which rationale is provided. Objectives clearly enable to address it. | Research question is clear and rationale is present. Objectives relate to it, although the link could have been clearer. | Research question is present, but its formulation, rationale and scope could have been improved. Some objectives are present and they broadly relate to the research question. | Research question is present but is not sufficiently clear and/or it is far too broad/narrow. Clear rationale is lacking, objectives are either lacking or not clearly linked with the question. | Research question is deeply flawed. Rationale is entirely unclear, and so are the objectives. | Research question is entirely unclear and incoherent. Rationale is missing, the objectives are missing or are incoherent. | Research question is missing. Rationale is missing. No objectives. |
| **Literature review**  **20%** | Impressive, critical, creative and flawless discussion of issues underpinning the research. | Selective and clearly focussed elaboration of the academic issues underpinning the research.  Critiques the relevance of the material drawn from extensive reading. | Selective and clearly focussed elaboration of the academic issues underpinning the research. Evidence of extensive reading around the topic. | Substantial elaboration of academic material underpinning the research question.  Good use of academic sources. | Just sufficient use of relevant sources.  Lack of clear focus on research question. | Limited academic support for the research question.  Some irrelevant material.  Over-use of general internet sources. | Very limited use of relevant sources. | Sources which are used do not inform or relate to the topic. | No literature review (no sources are used). |
| **Methodology**  **20%** | Impressive grasp of methodological issues. Ethical issues have been fully addressed. | Methodology is very consistent with the research question and the presented grasp of methodological issues is excellent. Ethical issues have been fully addressed. | Methodology is consistent with the research question and the presented grasp of methodological issues is very good. Ethical issues have been thoroughly addressed. | The presented understanding of methodological issues is appropriate, however certain aspects of the link with the research question could have been better explained. Ethical issues have been addressed. | Methodology is generally consistent with the research question, however there remain question marks regarding how certain aspects of the question have been addressed by the chosen methodology. Most ethical issues have been addressed. | Methodology is somewhat consistent with the research question, however there remain serious doubts regarding addressing certain aspects of the question. Few ethical issues have been addressed. | Methodology is not consistent with some aspects the research question. Ethical issues have not been satisfactorily addressed. | Methodology is inconsistent with the research question and does not allow addressing it. The discussion of ethical issues is either missing or is unclear. | No discussion of methodology is present. No discussion of ethical issues is present either. |
| **Findings, analysis and discussion**  **30%** | Flawless, highly creative discussion of findings. Impressive and critical link with the literature. A truly novel perspective on the problem. | Excellent and original research – discussion of findings is directly informed by the literature review and provides and original research-informed perspective on the problem in question. | Original findings and analysed in a research-informed and structured manner. Some aspects of the problem are presented from the original and meaningful perspective. | The findings are presented in a well structured manner and they relate to the literature discussed as well as enable to address the research question. | Findings are structured, but the links with the literature are not always clearly argued. Discussion of findings generally addresses the research question, although room for improvement is present. | Findings are present, but they are limited and they hardly connect with the literature reviewed. The discussion of findings generally connects with the overall topic of the dissertation, but the analysis is superficial or very unclear. | Findings are largely or entirely disconnected from the topic in question and their analysis is very poor. | Findings entirely disconnected from the topic and there is no attempt at analysing them in light of the topic. | No findings. No analysis. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Conclusion and implications (recommendations)**  **10%** | Flawless and highly impressive conclusion, creatively deduced from findings. Implications for practice are excellent. | Conclusions directly follow from findings and are highly original and pertinent to the topic. Implications for practice are very convincingly argued and strongly informed by research. | Strong and well informed conclusions. Recommendations follow from them logically and are relevant for practice. | Conclusions are relevant to findings and recommendations for practice are present, although they could have been more developed. | Conclusions are present and they are broadly relevant, although not all aspects of the problem are touched upon. Recommendations are brief and not fully developed. | Conclusions are poorly presented and they do not connect with the previous sections clearly enough. Recommendations are largely irrelevant. | Very poor conclusions. Recommendations are irrelevant. | No clear conclusions have been presented. Recommendations are missing or are entirely unclear and/or irrelevant. | No conclusions. No recommendations. |
| **Structure, presentation and referencing**  **10%** | Impressive and consistent clarity of expression. Flawless academic style. | Almost flawless. | Fluent, clear. Correct use of terminology and English. Careful proofreading, correctly cited and listed. | Mostly clear, very few grammatical or spelling errors. Minor flaws and omissions. | Some points unclear. Most words correctly spelt. Adequate, but some omissions. | Many points unclear. Some misuse of words, grammatical errors. Careless proofreading. Referencing is poor or incomplete. | Difficult to understand. Spelling, grammar and general use of English needs urgent attention. No referencing, or extremely poor referencing. | Extremely difficult to understand, mostly unclear. No referencing. | Entirely unclear or missing, no referencing. |
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