

**BMA0068 Dissertation Feedback Sheet**

Weigh ting %	Student Name / ID: Eva Tripska								
	Marker's names: Pamela Anderson and Alan McMahon								
	Specific criteria	Comments	Individual Grade						
A +			A	A -	B	C	D	R	F
5/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Introduction / Research problem</b> Clear overall aim and Formulation / Focus / Rationale</li> </ul>	The introduction to the topic was rather short. Whilst you laid out what your research questions are I think there needed to be more background to the reasons for undertaking this work. More explanation of the differences in approach and why you have picked those three areas for comparison					X		
12/2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Literature review</b> Critical awareness of relevant theory / Range of reading / Relation to research question / Independent research and overall coherent argument</li> </ul>	This section explains the relevant theories but does so in a very descriptive way. There would appear to be little critical analysis on the theories. Techniques used by Governments to stimulate the economy have been discussed but again this is descriptive. There is little literature showing how successful these techniques have been in the past. Also there is no discussion of other work that has been done on the post crisis period. This is crucial here to set the scene for this dissertation.						X	
9/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Design &amp; Methodology</b> Appreciation of methodological issues / Rationale for research approach and Conduct of data collection / Awareness of strengths and weaknesses and past research</li> </ul>	Some awareness of approach needed. Good explanation of reasons for choosing the three areas. The model you have chosen may well be the best one for this research however, I would be interested to see how much of it you understand based on its complexity. The explanation of each test is not very clear which may suggest a lack of full understanding of the statistical technique selected. There are many equations presented but in the results I can only see multiple regression shown. It would appear from the hypotheses that you are unsure of the difference between dependent and independent variables. The independent variables have an effect on the dependent, not the other way round as suggested by your hypotheses.						X	
12/2 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Analysis &amp; Discussion</b> Data collected and presentation / Appropriate analysis / Evaluation of findings / Reference back to the literature and clear audit of data extraction</li> </ul>	You have not shown all of the results that you are discussing, e.g. I can find no table showing the results of the unit root test or the Johansen test. Also you were asked to show raw data and how it was transformed for analysis and I cannot see that here. You have attempted to relate your findings to some						X	

		of the literature, however if your literature had been more extensive this would have been easier to do. You could have made a lot more of the differences in your findings and the reasons for them. You seem to have glossed over the different results for different variables. These also needed much better reference to the literature. Also you suddenly mention not using logarithms this and the impact it may have should have been discussed in the methodology.								
4.5/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendations &amp; Conclusions</b> Identify main findings / Strengths and weaknesses going forward</li> </ul>	Conclusion rather brief and much more could have been made of the limitations.						X		
5/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Presentation and expression</b> Referencing / Writing and Presentation / Use of language</li> </ul>	Whilst understandable there are some places where the English could be improved. Referencing needs checking as it is not always correct brackets often in the wrong place. There are many occasions where you refer to "previous research" this is not acceptable you must state the name and year of the research you are referring to.						X		

Agreed mark %:

48

1<sup>st</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> Marker's signature

Date