



Assessment Information

Subject Code:	BUS606
Subject Name:	Literature Review for Master of Business Research Project
Assessment Title:	Assessment 2 – Literature review
Weighting:	35 %
Total Marks:	35
Length:	2500 (not including reference list)
Due Date:	Submission due Week 9 – Sunday at 11.59 pm

COURSE: Master of Business (Research)	
Unit:	Business Research Proposal and Literature Review
Unit Code:	BUS606
Type of Assessment:	Assessment 2 – Literature review
Unit Learning Outcomes addressed:	(a) Demonstrate an advanced ability to initiate and prepare an original research proposal. (b) Demonstrate an advanced ability to prepare a literature review based on the support of an original research proposal. (c) Demonstrate a critical appreciation of the ethical issues associated with an original research proposal and their implications for the research and the acceptability of the research by an ethics review committee. (d) Critically evaluate the coherence, relevance and methodological merits of a given body of literature. (e) Demonstrate a critical understanding of the theoretical, practical and professional contexts and significance of the research. (f) Prepare a literature review that identifies and discriminates between concepts, issues, key findings and relevant theories most pertinent to the research proposal which the review supports.
Criteria for Assessment:	• Knowledge and understanding • Content and exploration of theories and ideas • Analysis, synthesis and critical engagement • Technical skills and referencing

Assessment Task:	Students are required to submit a literature review for their chosen project Your literature review should be shaped by your argument and should seek to establish your theoretical orientation, along with your methodological choices. Your literature review needs to conclude with what you have demonstrated as a 'need for research' in the area. This is the primary statement for the justification of the research project. The literature review needs to be organized with sub-headers in a meaningful manner based on your research topic. The language used in a literature review is often evaluative and demonstrates your perspectives of the literature in relation to your research question. Your 'voice' or your perspective, position or standpoint, should be identifiable in the literature review. It is important that, firstly, your theoretical position is clearly and strongly stated and that your critical evaluations are an integral part of this document. Secondly, it important that your language indicates your own or other writers' attitudes to the research question. The literature review always ends with a research question that will be the focus of the Master of Business Research thesis. You should follow the outline below: Title of literature review: In not more than 12 words state the title of your proposed research project and literature review Research Cluster: Identify the Research Cluster aligned to your research project • Cluster 1: Leadership and Management of Large Corporations • Cluster 2: Leadership and Management of Not-for Profit Organisations • Cluster 3: Leadership and Management of Start-ups, SMEs and Family Business • Cluster 4: Leadership and Management of Technological and Digital Transformation Cluster 5: Leadership and Management of Sustainable Business Operations • Cluster 6: Leadership and Management of Government and Multilateral Organisations • Cluster 7: Leadership and Management of Tourism and Hospitality Organisations Introduction Provide an overview of the literature review. Indicate the objectives of the literature review.
--------------------------------	--

	Literature review Use relevant headings and sub-headings to organize your literature review. Conclusion Your conclusion should provide a summary of the literature and show the gaps in the literature to be addressed by the research project, the proposed methods to be used and the expected contribution to the field of research from undertaking the research project.
Submission Date:	Week 9 (online submission).
Total Mark & Weighting:	35 marks 35%
Students are advised that any submissions past the due date without an approved extension or approved extenuating circumstances incur a 5% penalty <u>per calendar day</u>, calculated from the total mark e.g. a task marked out of 15 will incur a 1.75 mark penalty <u>per calendar day</u>.	

Marking rubrics					
Criteria	HD (High Distinction) 85%-100%	DN (Distinction) 75%-84%	CR (Credit) 74%-65%	P (Pass) 50%-64%	F (Fail) 0%-49%
Knowledge and understanding 5 marks	Command of the topic, unusual creativity, perception and insight, all suggesting that work should be published in an academic forum.	Demonstrates command of the topic by showing creativity, perception and insight — a serious contribution to the academic debate.	Demonstrates a well- informed understanding of the topic by showing creativity and insight — a serious contribution to the academic debate.	Understanding of contemporary academic debate, with some creative input and insight, with a tendency toward description.	Limited/poor understanding demonstrated. Any creative input is somewhat off the point.
Content and exploration of theories and ideas 10 marks	Outstanding selection that makes a substantial contribution to academic debate.	Outstanding selection from a wide relevant and innovative range of perspectives and sources.	Selection from a wide and relevant range of perspectives and sources that draws upon contemporary academic debate.	Relevant selection from a range of perspectives and sources. Sources are mostly integrated into the overall argument.	Narrow selection, minimal use of sources, to support the argument.
Analysis, synthesis and critical engagement 15 marks	Outstanding use of source material. Excellent argument that is of the highest academic quality.	Sources very well integrated into the overall argument. Clear well structured argument that is well crafted and	Sources well-integrated into the overall argument. Clear, cogent and well-structured	Mostly clear, cogent and well-structured argument. Demonstrates criticality and	Sources are not properly integrated into the argument. Absence of clear and cogent argument. Incomplete analysis

	Critical distance and outstanding analysis of the question, to a high degree of excellence.	cogent. Critical distance and outstanding analysis of the question.	argument. Critical distance and sound analysis of the question.	generally good analysis.	with a tendency to accept the source material at face value.
Technical skills and referencing 5marks	Referencing impeccable using appropriate conventions. No errors in grammar or spelling.	Referencing clear and accurate using appropriate conventions. Virtually no errors in grammar or spelling.	Referencing clear and accurate using appropriate conventions. Good grammar and spelling.	Referencing sufficiently clear and using an appropriate convention. Adequate grammar and spelling.	References limited/inappropriate. Many errors in grammar and spelling, making it difficult or impossible to read.