BHS0029 Management

BHS0029 Management Dissertation Feedback Sheet: 2018-19

Student Name and student number:	Martin Zanda, 1871021
Dissertation Title:	Consumers perception of sustainability of a food system in Czech Republic
Supervisor name:	John Lever
Markers name:	Jiajia Liu

Overall Quality of Writing including referencing, presentation, style and internal consistency: This dissertation explores a pertinent issue of sustainability in the food system, and has presented some interesting primary data and preliminary findings. The overall quality of writing is acceptable and the key arguments and conclusions are conveyed competently. However, this research also suffers from the following major flaws: 1) the motivation of focusing on 'consumer perception' of sustainability was not justified; 2) the scope of enquire was far too broad and thus the dataset was not able to provide any really insightful conclusions; 3) is overall very descriptive and lacks key theoretical or analytical underpinning.	15% 8
Abstract, Introduction, Aims and Objectives: The abstract is adequate, but the aims and objectives are not sufficiently articulated.	10* 6
Literature Review: The literature review gave a collection of descriptors, but does not serve the purpose of engaging with, and drawing from, contemporary debates on key concepts and theoretical understanding of the subject matter. Rather, it dotted around various definitions without much clear attempt of synthesis or critique.	25* 15
Methodology: The methodology is fulfilled with some information about the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions of the candidate. However, the justification for a quantitative study is not strong enough (resulting from a weak justification of studying perceptions), especially in the absence of a framework or model from prior studies. A qualitative pilot based on interviews or focus groups would have much strengthened the robustness of the empirical work. The review of various methods was weak as the candidate was merely going through the motion of describing them.	15* 7
Research Results, Analysis and Discussion: This is particularly weak, as the candidate did not present the results in any way of synthesis or summary. It was very descriptive and lacking in analysis.	25* 10

Conclusions and Recommendation: Due to the above-mentioned weakness in the execution of the empirical work, the conclusion was very superficial.	10* 4
Mark (please enter the mark given by first or second marker)	50%

Moderated Final Mark **1st marker signature John Lever** **2nd marker signature**.....	**Agreed Mark** **50**

Turnitin match % (to be completed only by first marker) **10%**