

**INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANCY ARUSHA
DIRECTORATE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
MASTERS PROGRAMME
MARKING SHEET FOR DISSERTATION REPORTS**

Student Surname (Family Name)		Forename(s) (Given Name)	
Student ID no.		Research Topic:	
<i>Supervisors Please fill all these fields in accurately</i>		Module Code	
Name of Internal Examiner		Name of Second Examiner	
Signature of Internal Examiner		Signature of Second Examiner	
Date of Marking		Date of Marking	

Grading System

Dissertation shall be awarded out of 100 percent – Any score below 50% shall be considered fail. The following shall be used for the purpose of grading:

Score Range	Grade	Definition
70 – 100	A	Excellent

60 – 69	B+	Very Good
50 – 59	B	Pass
40 – 49	C	Fail
35 – 39	D	Fail
0 – 34	F	Absolute Fail

KEY ISSUES DESCRIBED

1. Abstract [4%]

- 1.1. Doesn't abstract exceed 500 words in length? [1%]
- 1.2. Is abstract concise and in a single paragraph, written in a rational and scientific manner for easy understanding? [1%]
- 1.3. Does abstract constitute the following (in brief)
 - 1.3.1. Practical, scientific, theoretical or artistic gap the research/project is filling (Motivation/problem statement) [0.5%]
 - 1.3.2. Very brief but clear methods/procedure/approach [0.5%]
 - 1.3.3. Very brief but clear main results/findings/product [0.5%]
 - 1.3.4. Very brief but clear larger implications of the findings, especially for the problem/gap identified above (Conclusion/implications/recommendations) [0.5%]

2. Introduction [10%]

- 2.1. Is the relevant background presented, discussed and explained well? [2%]
- 2.2. Is the research problem clearly specified and contextualized? [2%]
- 2.3. How clear are the objectives of the proposed research? [2%]
- 2.4. Are the research questions and/or hypotheses clearly formulated? [2%]
- 2.5. Does the dissertation capture clear relevance/rationale/ justification of the chosen topic? [2%]

3. Literature Review [20%]

- 3.1. Does the dissertation include a comprehensive review of (both theoretical and empirical) relevant literature?. A candidate should demonstrate deeply impressive command of literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail [4%].
- 3.2. Is there critique of existing literature and is it clearly linked back to the relevance of the chosen topic? [4%]
- 3.3. Is there demonstration of sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence? Or is there a description on how the proposed research positions itself within the generic context of the previous studies in the area under investigation? [4%]
- 3.4. Does the candidate demonstrate a systematic understanding of the relevant background theory and knowledge? [4%]
- 3.5. Is the theory been contextualized appropriately within the framework of the research problem in question? [4%]

4. Research Plan/Methodology [20%]

- 4.1. Is the adopted methodology and/or design approach clearly described and justified? [2%]
- 4.2. Does the dissertation demonstrate exemplary sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods? [2%]
- 4.3. Are data analysis techniques relevant to specific objectives of research? [4%]
- 4.4. Is the sampling method and makeup of the sample clearly described? [2%]
- 4.5. Are research tools or data collection methods standard and clearly explained? [4%]
- 4.6. Have the issues of validity, reliability and generalisability been addressed? [3%]
- 4.7. Is there a clear identification of any limitations, assumptions and constraints which may influence the applied methodology, research design and implementation? [3%]

5. Data Analysis, Presentation and Discussion [32%]

- 5.1. Are data reliable and valid? (i.e. enough and right data in relation to objectives of stud) [5%]
- 5.2. Are the results clearly presented and analyzed objectively? [8%].
- 5.3. Are the results discussed objectively and adequately? [8%].

- 5.4. Do the results lead to appropriate conclusions and/or fulfillment of the study objectives? [6%].
- 5.5. Does the analysis, evaluation and discussion of results exhibit independence of thought? Are there new ideas? [5%].

6. Conclusion, Recommendations and Policy Implications and Critical Evaluation of the Study [10%]

- 6.1. Are the conclusions consistent with the results/findings? [2%]
- 6.2. How closely do the conclusions address the objectives? [2%]
- 6.3. Has knowledge been extended? [1%]
- 6.4. How appropriate/feasible are the recommendations? [2%]
- 6.5. Has the need for any further research been addressed? [1%]
- 6.6. What happened when doing the dissertation? What went well, what went wrong, was research techniques manageable? What would the student do if he/she were to repeat the same research again? [2%].

7 Overall Comments[4%]

- 7.1 Is the student's contribution clearly communicated to the reader? [1%].
- 7.2 Is the style and structure of the dissertation logical, coherent, flowing and focused? [1%].
- 7.3 Does it make good use of language, citations, figures and tables? Are there relatively few typographical errors? [1%].
- 7.4 Is the referencing good [1%].

8. Dissertation Report Presentation Marks (Marks as per Panel) [10 %]
