

BUIL 1306 - Assessment 3

Research Thesis – Part A

Worth 70% of the final mark for BUIL1306

This assessment task requires you to write the first three chapters of your honours research thesis. This assessment tests your achievement of the following Course and Program Learning Outcomes:

Course Learning Outcomes:

- Identify a research problem
- Systematically undertake a research inquiry which meets established ethical guidelines and principles
- Analyse and synthesise relevant literature and produce a literature review
- Select and apply an appropriate research methodology
- Plan an approach to primary and/or secondary data collection

Program Learning Outcomes:

- Determine and apply discipline and theoretical knowledge to your professional practice and/or further study
- Professionally communicate to a range of audiences utilising diverse formats and strategies, demonstrating in depth knowledge of the discipline and responsiveness to the needs of diverse stakeholders
- Apply logical, critical and creative thinking to analyse, synthesise and apply theoretical knowledge, and technical skills, to formulate evidenced based solutions to industry problems or issues
- Utilise appropriate methods and techniques to design and /or execute a theory-research based or professionally- focused research project demonstrating capacity for independent and collaborative learning, addressing real world industry issues
- Collaborate effectively with others and demonstrate intellectual independence and autonomy to solve problems and/or address industry issues and imperatives
- Critically examine and reflect on the profession, in local and/or global contexts, and question accepted interpretations and decision making

INSTRUCTIONS - OVERVIEW

This assessment task requires you to write the first three chapters of your honours research thesis. Please follow the structure as provided below:

-----*Prescribed Thesis Structure*-----

Title Page

- Student name
- Project title and Date
- Academic supervisor and industry mentor
- Name of School and University

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction (~1200 words)

- 1.1 Introduction and Background*
- 1.2 Problem Statement/Research Rationale*
- 1.3 Aims and Objectives/Research Questions*
- 1.4. Limitations of Research

Chapter 2: Literature Review (~4000 words)

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 At least three subheadings, could be more*
- 2.5 Summary

Chapter 3: Research Methodology (~1200 words)

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Research Methodology
- 3.3 Research Methods and Data Sources
- 3.4 Summary

References (Harvard Style) (Not included in the word limit)

Appendix

*(*Word count is a guide only and may change based on your particular research and advice from your supervisor)*

You have some flexibility in the required thesis structure above in the sections indicated through the italic font. For example, you may decide to merge the sub-chapters 1.1, 1.2., and 1.3 and/or you can have further sub-chapters under each subheading as required.

INSTRUCTIONS – FURTHER DETAILS

Generally

Make sure you review and understand the marking rubric at the end of this document.

Background/Introduction

- Discuss research and industry context and background information
- Consider terminology: Are there terms you should define for your audience?

Problem statement/Research rationale

- What is the problem?
- Why is it an important problem and how it relates to the industry?
- How does your research address this problem?

Aims and objectives/Research questions

- Clearly state your aims and objectives and/or research question(s)
- Make sure the question cannot be answered with a Yes or No.

Literature review

The key purpose of your literature review is to enable you to identify the existing knowledge that you can build on and the research gaps and problems that relate to your research topic. The aim is to situate your topic in the context of current literature. In doing so, you will need to develop and apply literature searching skills to identify relevant academic publications.

The aims of your literature review are to:

- Provide background information needed to understand and frame your research topic
- Demonstrate familiarity with the important research which has been done in your topic area
- Identify how your research can and will build on existing knowledge
- Critically evaluate independently sourced peer reviewed articles and construct a coherent argument supporting your research topic.

Remember, that when writing a literature review you are not simply listing peer reviewed articles that have some connection to your research topic. Instead, you are analysing these articles and discussing their relevance by critically evaluating their content within the context of your own research topic. Good literature reviews bring articles together to support an underpinning narrative that justifies the research you are undertaking.

In completing your literature review you will address these aims using an academic writing style that is clear and concise.

Research methodology

Discuss your overall research methodology that you plan to adopt. For each of the research methods in your methodology, discuss why you picked it and what data/information sources you plan and how you plan to analyse the data/information. Ensure you make it clear how your research methodology will help you answer your research question.

Referencing and formatting

You must use citations (using RMIT's Harvard format) to acknowledge authorship and include a complete **reference list (using RMIT's Harvard format) in the reference section.**

All sources must be referenced appropriately, and all figures and tables must be numbered, titled and integrated into the body of the report.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Electronic submission

Submit as **one** electronic PDF file through Turnitin on the BUIL1306 Canvas website.

Submission format

Name your file as: LastNameFirstNameInitial_studentID_A3.pdf

(e.g. SmithJ_345678_A3.pdf)

Length: ~6000-6500 words (excluding references)

Paper size : A4

Main text of paper : Single spacing, justified

Paragraphs : Single space between paragraphs

Left margin : 30 mm

All other margins : 25 mm

Referencing style : RMIT's Harvard Style

File Format: *.pdf (To generate an Adobe PDF file, either save your file as PDF or print to a PDF printer, such as "Cute PDF".)

Submission

All assignments are to be submitted to the Canvas website.

This task is to be submitted in accordance with the University submissions policy.

Submissions must be made by the due date. The policies associated with requests for extension and special consideration can be found at the link below. Please ask the course coordinator/program manager if you are in doubt regarding the policy.

<https://www.rmit.edu.au/students/student-essentials/assessment-and-exams>

Academic Integrity

Students are reminded that cheating, whether by fabrication, falsification of data, or plagiarism, is an offence subject to University disciplinary procedures. Plagiarism in written submissions is not acceptable. It is also an offence for students to allow their work to be plagiarised by another student or to include names of colleagues/team members who did not contribute to the project. Remember to always provide full citation of the reference material used throughout your submission. Details of the University policy regarding academic integrity can be found at the following link:

<http://www.rmit.edu.au/students/academic-integrity>

MARKING RUBRIC (INCLUDING POINT DISTRIBUTION)

All grading criteria (i.e. the rows) for a section of your thesis (e.g. “Intro”) will be considered holistically when determining your grade for the section.

Intro (30)	HD (30 – 24)	DI (23-21)	CR (20 – 18)	PA (17 – 15)	NN (14 – 0)
Clear articulation of research rationale supported by quality, credible and relevant evidence	Clear articulation of research rationale supported by a substantial breadth of quality, credible and relevant evidence	Clear articulation of research rationale supported by quality, credible and relevant evidence	Generally clear articulation of research rationale, which consistently draws upon quality, credible and relevant evidence	Satisfactory articulation of research rationale which generally draws upon quality, credible and relevant evidence	Research rationale is not clearly articulated. Discussion is not supported by sufficient quality credible and relevant evidence
Referencing conforms to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and effectively and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used effectively and generally/mostly consistently and referencing conforms to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used to acknowledge sources, but may not be used consistently, while referencing generally conforms to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and/or in use of citations and in the reference list	In-text references are not used effectively to acknowledge sources and/or referencing does not conform to RMIT’s Harvard style both in text and in the reference list

Intro (continued)	HD (30 – 24)	DI (23-21)	CR (20 – 18)	PA (17 – 15)	NN (14 – 0)
Effective and appropriate use of academic language (English) with clear sentence structure and evidence of thorough proof reading and editing	Sophisticated and highly effective use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Generally capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Proof reading and editing is evident	Satisfactory use of academic language with some inconsistencies in the use of language and clarity of sentence structure. Minimal evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre:	Minimal or no use of academic language with frequent inconsistencies in the clarity of sentence structure. No evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre:
Coherent, well developed and logical argument	Argument is very well developed, coherent and logical	Argument is well developed coherent, and logical	Argument is generally well developed, coherent and logical	Argument is developing, with some inconsistencies in coherence of argument and logical structure	No evidence of a clearly developed and coherent argument, ideas are not developed logically
Research Question (5)	HD (5)	DI (4)	CR (3)	PA (2)	NN (2 – 0)
Clear articulation of research question supported by rationale	Research question is clearly articulated and strongly supported by the rationale	Research question is clearly articulated and supported by the rationale	Research question is clearly articulated, alignment with the rationale is developing	Research question is generally clearly articulated with alignment to the rationale emerging	Research question is not clearly defined or articulated and is not aligned with the rationale

Research question is designed to explore/examine the research topic in depth	Research question is designed to explore/examine the research topic in depth	Research question is designed to explore/examine the research topic in depth	Research question is designed to explore/examine the research topic in depth	Research question invites limited yes /no answers	Research question invites limited yes /no answers
Literature Review (50)	HD (50 – 40)	DI (39 – 35)	CR (34 – 30)	PA (29 – 25)	NN (24 – 0)
Integrates relevant ideas from credible sources to explore the existing knowledge.	Sophisticated integration of relevant ideas from credible sources to explicitly identify how the research contributes to and builds on the existing knowledge	Capable integration of relevant ideas from credible sources to identify how the research contributes to and builds on the existing knowledge	Generally capable integration of relevant ideas from credible sources. Identification of how the research contributes to and builds on the existing knowledge is developing	Satisfactory integration of relevant ideas from credible sources. Identification of how the research contributes to and builds on the existing knowledge is emerging	Minimal or no integration of relevant ideas with some or all sources not credible; identification of how research contributes to and builds on the existing knowledge is not consistently established
Analysis and synthesis of relevant literature, analysis directly addresses the research question	Sophisticated and Highly Capable analysis and synthesis of relevant literature. Discussion directly addresses the research question and demonstrates a strong link between the literature and the question	Capable analysis and synthesis of relevant literature. Discussion directly addresses the research question and consistently demonstrates a strong link between the literature and the question	A clear analysis and synthesis of relevant literature. Discussion generally addresses the research question demonstrates a developing link between the literature and the question	A satisfactory analysis and synthesis of consistently relevant literature Links between the literature and the research question are emerging	Minimal or no analysis and synthesis of literature, with most or all sources irrelevant; minimal or no linkage between relevant literature and the research question

Referencing conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and effectively and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used effectively and generally/mostly consistently and referencing conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used to acknowledge sources, but may not be used consistently, while referencing generally conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and/or in use of citations and in the reference list	In-text references are not used effectively to acknowledge sources and/or referencing does not conform to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list
Effective and appropriate use of academic language (English) with clear sentence structure and evidence of thorough proof reading and editing	Sophisticated and highly effective use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Generally capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Proof reading and editing is evident	Satisfactory use of academic language with some inconsistencies in the use of language and clarity of sentence structure. Minimal evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre:	Minimal or no use of academic language with frequent inconsistencies in the clarity of sentence structure. No evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre:

Research Methodology (15)	HD (15 – 12)	DI (11 – 10)	CR (10 – 9)	PA (8 – 7)	NN (6 – 0)
Provides a clear outline and justification for the proposed research methodology, which complies with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines [Human Research Ethics: Research Integrity at RMIT:	Very clear outline of proposed methodology with a well-argued justification as to why the methodology has been selected and how it will help answer the research question. Proposed methodology complies with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	Clear outline of proposed research methodology with a clear justification as to why the methodology has been selected and how it will help answer the research question. Proposed methodology complies with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	Generally presents a clear outline of proposed methodology with a developing justification as to why the proposed methodology has been selected and how it will help answer the research question. Proposed methodology complies with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	A satisfactory outline of the proposed research methodology with an emerging justification as to why the proposed research methodology has been selected and how it will help answer the research question. Proposed methodology complies with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	Outline lacks clarity with minimal or no justification as to why the proposed research methodology has been selected and how it will help answer the research question. Proposed methodology may not comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.
Provides a clear outline and justification for the proposed research methods, which comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines [Human Research Ethics: Research Integrity at RMIT:	Very clear outline of proposed methods and the information/data sources to be considered. Very well-argued justification as to why the research methods have been selected. Proposed methods comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	Clear outline of proposed research methods and the information/data sources to be considered. Clear justification as to why the research methods have been selected. Proposed methods comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	A generally clear outline of proposed research methods and the information/data sources to be considered. Justification as to why the research methods have been selected is developing. Proposed methods comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	A satisfactory outline of the proposed research methods and the information/data sources to be considered. Justification as to why the research methods have been selected is emerging. Proposed methods comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.	Outline lacks clarity with little or no justification as to why the proposed research methods have been selected. Proposed methods may not comply with RMIT's Research Integrity and Human Research Ethics Guidelines.

Referencing conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and effectively and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used effectively and generally/mostly consistently and referencing conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used consistently and referencing consistently conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list	In-text references are used to acknowledge sources, but may not be used consistently, while referencing generally conforms to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and/or in use of citations and in the reference list	In-text references are not used effectively to acknowledge sources and/or referencing does not conform to RMIT's Harvard style both in text and in the reference list (
Effective and appropriate use of academic language (English) with clear sentence structure and evidence of thorough proof reading and editing	Sophisticated and highly effective use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Thorough proof reading and editing	Generally capable use of academic language with clear sentence structure. Proof reading and editing is evident	Satisfactory use of academic language with some inconsistencies in the use of language and clarity of sentence structure. Minimal evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre:	Minimal or no use of academic language with frequent inconsistencies in the clarity of sentence structure. No evidence of proof reading and editing [Students who need help addressing this criterion should consider using the support offered by RMIT's Study and Learning Centre: