ASSESSMENT BRIEF

Academic year and term:	2022/23 – Semester H
Module title:	Business Research Methods
	For further module description see Module Brief (LTAF).
Assessment deadlines – Sem. H:	Formative assessment (one-page outline): **Monday 5 June 2023** Summative Coursework (multi-question assignment): **Monday 10 July**

Instructions for assessment

Component	Individual or group work?	Word count	% weighting	Must attempt	Must pass
Coursework (multi-question assignment)	Individual	max. 3,500 words	100%	Yes	Yes

You are asked to produce a report, which consists of three activities:

Section 1. Please provide a detailed critique of at least two well-used research methodologies.
Section 2. Please construct a research instrument that could be used to collect data in your capstone project. You will not be collecting any data – just designing the tool.
Section 3. Please reflect upon the audience and critical aspects of research dissemination in the specific context of your potential research findings and outcomes from the developed instrument.

Should you fail the assessment at the first attempt and be referred to retake the coursework, only the failed individual elements will need to be reworked, with 10% of the re-sit mark awarded for an additional reflective statement demonstrating how you learnt from the feedback and what you did differently the second time.

The final report should be submitted via Moodle to a turn-it-in box and will be graded according to the following marking criteria (see more instructions of the writing of above sections outlined under "Structure and presentation" below):

Section 1 – Clarity and justification of research problem	10%
Section 1 – For the literature analysis, breadth and depth of explored research with a clear focus emerging	15%
Section 1 – Critique of two specific research methods	40%
Section 2 – Demonstration of the proposed research instrument's potential for new knowledge generation and rigour in deduction of conclusions	10%
Section 3 – Comprehensive appraisal of research dissemination requirements	15%

All sections – Form and presentation **(this section only for main submission)**	10%
Applies to re-sit only – Reflective section **marked instead of "Form and Presentation"**	10%

Additional instructions for re-sit

The same assignment task as for the main assignment period applies to the re-sit, with further instructions see below.

Re-sit deadlines will be published via Moodle. Visit the module's Moodle site and check your Roehampton email account on a regular basis. The school is not obliged to check whether you have noticed re-sit deadlines.

You are required to improve and resubmit your original work as well as adding a further reflective commentary discussing what you have learned from the process. You must resubmit your work using the specific re-sit Turnitin link on Moodle.

The original marking criteria will still apply (see marking weights provided above and marking grid provided below) except that the 10% weighting for presentation will be awarded instead to your reflective piece.

You should:

- Review your previously submitted work and read carefully the feedback given by the marker.

- Use this feedback to help you revisit and rewrite your work, improving it in the areas identified as weak in the original marking process

- Include with your resubmission an additional reflective piece (400-700 words) on what you understand was weak, how you set about addressing this and what you have learned from this that may help you with further assignments. You should address the following specifically:

  o Identify tutor feedback points on your original work and identify where/how the resit work has changed (give page number) in response to feedback

  o Identify the lessons you have learnt from doing the resit

  o Reflect on how your feedback and this process will help you improve future assignments

If you did not submit work at the first opportunity, you cannot reflect on your feedback. However, you are still required to submit a reflective piece in which you identify your reasons for non-submission, the implications of non-submission for your future success and how you propose to address this in the future. If you have issues with confidentiality of your reasons for non-submission then you could reflect on how you have met the learning outcomes for the module, how you can use what you have done on the module to support your future career and what skills/employability attributes you feel the module has helped you to develop.

If you were deferred at the first assessment opportunity you do not need to include the reflective piece as this is a first submission at a later date, not a re-sit.

Structure and presentation

Any written work should be spell-checked, and a contents page should be included. Do <u>not</u> use various font sizes and colours. Black ink, Arial, size 11, 1.5 lines spaced is recommended. Use DIN A4 format and page margins of 2.5 cm or 1 inch.

Your report should be presented in good academic style, having been formatted using the Harvard referencing system and proofread for grammatical errors. It should not exceed 3,500 words including tables and figures but excluding references.

Section 1: Comparing two research methodologies

Select a topic of interest or business problem relevant to your degree specialism, e.g. strategy, supply chain management, international business & economics, marketing, finance, or human resources. Choose one of these topics that motivates you and that you are likely to pursue for your Dissertation or Consultancy Project (you may change your mind later, but it will be to your advantage if you stick to it, so choose carefully). This will require some preliminary research into that specific area.

Provide the following subsections and address the following tasks for the chosen business problem:

1.1 Research problem	Short explanation of the research problem and the particular question that you would want to study (about 150 words).
1.2 Selected key readings	An introduction that provides a brief commentary of key relevant literature. Be sure to justify your choice of these references in introducing the existing knowledge on your topic (about 500 words). Attach a full visual presentation such as a mind map, a Venn diagram, or a grandfather, father, son literature map in the report's appendix to show the scope of your review of literature. That visual presentation will be considered when marking together with your brief commentary.
1.3 Two appropriate research methods	A detailed critique of at least two well-used research methodologies in the literature you have reviewed. Discuss a) how they are applied; b) how the methods were deployed to provide a worthwhile contribution to theory and research and c) what gaps the methods may leave that could lend the area to further analysis (and an opportunity for your own research). Discuss pros and cons of methods in the context of the proposed research question / research problem; and demonstrate full awareness of constraints and limitations deriving from investigation (about 1,500 words).

Section 2: Instrument and Conclusions

Provide the following subsections and address the following tasks for the chosen business problem:

2.1 Instrument	• Provide the details of a proposed research instrument such as, an interview guide, survey questionnaire, or other appropriate instruments. Provide this as an appendix to your report. • Write 500 words of reflection, regarding how you have designed the instrument and why the way you did. The instrument is only for illustrative purposes and does not necessarily have to be complete.
2.2 Conclusions	Concluding evaluation of instrument's expected value for the research question(s) that you consider worthy of further investigation, and reflective by taking section 1 into account (about 350 words).
2.3 Bibliography (covers section 1 and 2)	A bibliography containing a minimum of 12 references to relevant journal articles from good academic sources, including at least 6 published in the last 24 months and all cited in your analysis. Please include all references referred to in section one and two here. Note that the references listed in the full visual presentation (see subsection 1.2) must also be included here.

Section 3: Research Dissemination

Provide the following subsections and address the following tasks for the chosen business problem:

3.1 Relevance and audience	Briefly explain who and why may be the right audience for implementing the potential findings from the suggested research (about 200 words).
3.2 Communication of research	Reflect what kind of summarising, media, and design of the report would be needed to disseminate the outcomes properly and most effectively. Who could be partners in public organisations, NGOs, associations, or industry? (about 200 words).

Formative assessment

You are invited to submit a one-page outline specifying in brief full sentence bullet points how you think to address the following tasks:

- 1.1 Research problem, especially a precise definition and justification why chosen

- 1.3 Two appropriate research methods, especially how these are suitable to address the problem stated in 1.1.

- 2.1 Instrument, especially what research arenas & disciplines, ideas, examples read, techniques, or any other input will inform how that instrument is created.

The purpose of the formative submission is to receive feedback and to be advised what are the points with the most radical potential to improve the work. The formative assessment will not be marked, and it will not be considered in any form when the final submission is reviewed.

Reading List

Essential Readings

Baaij, M. (2014) *An Introduction to Management Consultancy*, Sage, London.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015) *Business Research Methods* (4th edition). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Recommended Readings

Chen, A.H., Peng, N., & Hackley, C. (2008) Evaluating service marketing in airline industry and its influence on student passengers' purchasing behaviour using Taipei: London route as an example. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25 (2), 149–160

Chen, A., Peng, N., & Hung, K. P. (2015). The effects of luxury restaurant environments on diners' emotions and loyalty: incorporating diner expectations into an extended Mehrabian-Russell model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *27*(2), 236-260.

Feng, M., Yu, W., Chavez, R., Mangan, J., & Zhang, X. (2017). Guanxi and operational performance: the mediating role of supply chain integration. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *117*(8), 1650-1668.

Fisher, C. (2010) *Researching and Writing a Dissertation: An Essential Guide for Business Students* (3nd ed.). Harlow, Essex: FT Prentice Hall.

Gary, T. (2009) *How to Do Your Research Project. A Guide for Students in Education and Applied Social Science*. London, Sage.

Hagos, S., Izak, M., & Scott, J. M. (2018). Objective institutionalized barriers and subjective performance factors of new migrant entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.

Hung, K.P., Chen, A.H., Peng, N., Hackley, C., Tiwsakul, R.A., & Chou, C.L. (2011) Antecedents of luxury brand purchase intention. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 20 (6), 457–467.

Loeffler, T. (2004). A photo elicitation study of the meanings of outdoor adventure experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36(4), 2159-6417.

Massaro, M., Dumay, J., & Guthrie, J. (2016) On the shoulders of giants: undertaking a structured literature review. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 29, 767-801.

Miller, T.W. (2019) *Data Visualization and Text Principles and Practices: The Eye of Data Science*. FT Press Analytics). Pearson FT Press, New York (forthcoming).

Newton, R. (2016) *Project Management Step by Step: How to Plan and Manage a Highly Successful Project* (2nd edn.). Pearson, Harlow

Ng, W. & Coakes, E. (2013) *Business Research: Enjoy Creating, Developing and Writing your Business Project*. Kogan Page, London.

O'Mahoney, J. & Markham, C. (2013) *Management Consultancy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Slack, R., & Munz, M. (2016) Intellectual capital reporting, leadership and strategic change. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 17(1), 61–83.

Sturdy, A, Handley, K, Clark, T & Fincham, R (2010) *Management Consultancy: Boundaries and Knowledge in Action*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367.

Vourvachis, P. & Woodward, T. (2015) Content analysis in social and environmental reporting research: trends and challenges. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 16 (2), 166–195.

Wallendorf, M., & Arnould, E.J. (1991). "We gather together": consumption rituals of Thanksgiving day. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(1), 13-31.

Warren, S. (2018) *Research using Secondary Sources: A guide for Business, Management and Organization*. Routledge, Abingdon and New York.

Weyrauch, V.; Echt, L., & Arrieta, D. (2013) How to Communicate Research for Policy Influence. Toolkit No.1: First approach to research communication. Buenos Aires. CIPPEC (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a16e5274a31e00003fc/Guia-01-serie-3-ingles.pdf).

Willis, J.W. & Edwards, C. (2014) *Action Research: Models, Methods, and Examples*, Applied Research in Education and the Social Sciences, Age Publishing, Charlotte.

Yang, X., Mao, H., Jia, L., & Bublitz, M. G. (2018). A Sweet Romance: Divergent Effects of Romantic Stimuli on the Consumption of Sweets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *45*(6), 1213-1229.

Yu, W., Ramanathan, R., & Nath, P. (2017). Environmental pressures and performance: An analysis of the roles of environmental innovation strategy and marketing capability. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *117*, 160-169.

Zarantonello L., Formisano M., & Grappi S. (2016) The relationship between brand love and actual brand performance: evidence from an international study. *International Marketing Review*, 33 (6), 806–824.

Zarantonello, L., & Luomala, H.T. (2011). Dear Mr Chocolate: constructing a typology of contextualized chocolate consumption experiences through qualitative diary research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 14 (1), 55-82.

Referencing and submission

You must use the **Harvard System**.

The Business School requires a digital version of all assignment submissions. These must be submitted via Turnitin on the module's Moodle site. They must be submitted as a Word file (not as a pdf) and must not include scanned in text or text boxes. They must be submitted by 2pm on the given date. For further general details on coursework preparation refer to the online information at
https://library.roehampton.ac.uk/referencing/roeharvard

Mitigating circumstances/what to do if you cannot submit a piece of work or attend your presentation

The University Mitigating Circumstances Policy can be found on the University website: Mitigating Circumstances Policy

How will your work be assessed?

Your work will be assessed by a subject expert who will use either the marking criteria provided in the section "Instructions for assessment" or the Marking rubric enclosed in the Appendix, as appropriate for this module. When you access your marked work, it is important that you reflect on the feedback so that you can use it to improve future assignments.

Marking and feedback process

Between you handing in your work and then receiving your feedback and marks within 20 days, there are a number of quality assurance processes that we go through to ensure that students receive marks which reflects their work. A brief summary is provided below.

- **Step One** – The module and marking team meet to agree standards, expectations and how feedback will be provided.

- **Step Two** – A subject expert will mark your work using the criteria provided in the assessment brief.

- **Step Three** – A moderation meeting takes place where all members of the teaching and marking team will review the marking of others to confirm whether they agree with the mark and feedback.

- **Step Four** – Work at Levels 5 and 6 then goes to an external examiner who will review a sample of work to confirm that the marking between different staff is consistent and fair.

- **Stop Five** – Your mark and feedback are processed by the Office and made available to you.

Appendix: Marking rubric for Summative assignment

Rubric category (range) Assigned mark >> Marking criteria (weight out of 100)	Outstanding (90-99) 100	Excellent (80-89) 85	Very Good (70-79) 75	Good (60-69) 65	Adequate (50-59) 55	Marginal Fail (40-49) 45	Fail (30-39) 35	Fail (20-29) 25	Not done 0
Clarity and justification of research problem (section 1) **(10%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Topic introduced in an articulated and well-supported fashion; extensive use of appropriate examples or references. Research question clearly followed up consistently in subsequent sections of the submission.	Very good effort at introducing the topic; insightful examples and very good references provided to support arguments. Research question clearly followed up consistently in subsequent sections of the submission.	Good effort at introducing the topic; good examples or references provided to support arguments.	Generally adequate effort at introducing the topic; some examples or references provided to support arguments.	Some effort at introducing the topic; few examples or references provided to support arguments.	Weak effort at introducing the topic; very few examples or references provided to support arguments.	Insufficient effort at introducing the topic; no examples given, and very limited number of references provided to support arguments.	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.
Literature analysis (section 1) **(15%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Comprehensive, systematic, and critical analysis; authoritative sources included; all citations and references in Harvard format. Clear and comprehensive literature map is attached.	Critical review and synthesis of ideas; material mostly selected from authoritative sources; almost all citations and references in Harvard format. literature map is mostly clear and comprehensive.	Good analysis of the literature, quite critical and well-developed; material selected mainly from authoritative sources; most citations and references in Harvard format. Literature map lacking minor parts or contributions.	Ideas organised into a coherent argument; some critical analysis of ideas; material selected from a mix of sources, including non-authoritative ones; some errors in citations and references. Literature map lacking some parts or contributions.	Relatively poor organisation and analysis of ideas; material selected mainly from non-authoritative sources; significant errors in citations and references. Literature map lacking several parts.	Very poor organisation and analysis of ideas; limited sources selected; major errors in citations and references. Literature map lacking several and major parts.	Ideas organised randomly or not organised at all; very limited sources selected; citations and references are not appropriate. Literature map not appropriately developed.	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.
Critique of two specific research methods (section 1) **(40%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Most appropriate research method selected and very well-explained; full awareness of constraints and limitations deriving from investigation.	Appropriate research method selected and well-explained; very good awareness of constraints and limitations deriving from investigation.	Appropriate research method selected and presented and clearly explained; good awareness of constraints and limitations deriving from investigation.	Generally appropriate research method selected; general awareness of constraints and limitations deriving from investigation.	Selection of research method not very well explained or not fully appropriate; some awareness of constraints and limitations	Selection of research method not well explained or not appropriate; limited awareness of constraints and limitations	Selection of research method not at all explained or not appropriate; very limited awareness, if any, of constraints and	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.

Rubric category (range) Assigned mark >> Marking criteria (weight out of 100)	Outstanding (90-99) 100	Excellent (80-89) 85	Very Good (70-79) 75	Good (60-69) 65	Adequate (50-59) 55	Marginal Fail (40-49) 45	Fail (30-39) 35	Fail (20-29) 25	Not done 0
				investigation.		deriving from investigation.	deriving from investigation.	limitations deriving from investigation.	
Demonstration of the proposed research instrument's potential for new knowledge generation and rigour in deduction of conclusions (section 2) **(10%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Insightful evaluation and critical discussion of the chosen research method's potential in specific context of research problem.	Perceptive appraisal of the chosen research method's potential in specific context of research problem.	Overall good appraisal of the chosen research method's potential in specific context of research problem	Potential for new knowledge generation is addressed but not in expected rigour.	Potential for new knowledge generation is somewhat alluded to.	Very limited appraisal.	Insufficient, vague and unclear appraisal.	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.
Appraisal of research dissemination requirements (section 3) **(15%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Insightful, comprehensive appraisal that demonstrates a very good understanding of the variety of research cultures, including academic scholarship, corporate in-house research and business consulting.	Perceptive appraisal that demonstrates a very good understanding of the variety of research cultures, including academic scholarship, corporate in-house research and business consulting.	Good appraisal that does address research dissemination requirements still appropriately.	In general, a valid appraisal, with some limitations.	Appraisal that does address research dissemination requirements to some extent; limited depth.	Research dissemination requirements more alluded to than discussed in appropriate detail or convincingly.	Insufficient, vague and unclear appraisal.	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.
Form and presentation (all sections) **(10%)**	Outstanding and flawless.	Clear, concise, and effectively argued within the length allowed; skilled use of academic conventions; accurate proof-reading.	Very good control of length; skilled use of academic conventions; nearly all errors eliminated in proof-reading.	Competent control of length; good use of academic conventions; accurate spelling, grammar, etc.; careful proof-reading.	Length requirements observed; appropriate use of academic conventions; minor errors in spelling, grammar etc.; quite careful proof-reading.	Presentation is either too long or too short in relation to content; some errors in application of academic conventions; some errors in	Poorly presented work; presentation is either too short or too long (waffling); missing several elements or parts; major errors in spelling, grammar etc.;	Very poorly presented work; presentation is inadequate, unfocused, and not at all clear; missing several and key elements or parts; spelling, grammar etc. are	Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted.

Rubric category (range) Assigned mark >> Marking criteria (weight out of 100)	Outstanding (90-99) 100	Excellent (80-89) 85	Very Good (70-79) 75	Good (60-69) 65	Adequate (50-59) 55	Marginal Fail (40-49) 45	Fail (30-39) 35	Fail (20-29) 25	Not done 0
						spelling, grammar etc.; some indication of proof-reading.	little indication of proof-reading.	very scarce; no indication of proof-reading.	