



COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Master Thesis Project 1	

Lecturer(s)	Department(s) where the course unit (module) is delivered
Coordinator: ass. prof. L. Urbsiene Other(s): academic advisors of Master's Final Thesis	Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Vilnius University

Study cycle	Type of the course unit (module)
Second	Compulsory

Mode of delivery	Period when the course unit (module) is delivered	Language(s) of instruction
Individual work, consultations	Spring semester	English

Requirements for students	
Prerequisites: the knowledge of graduate courses	Additional requirements (if any): none

Course (module) volume in credits	Total student's workload	Contact hours	Self-study hours
5	130	4	122

Purpose of the course unit (module): programme competences to be developed		
<p>The aim is to choose the Master thesis topic in business management or economics and to write the Master Thesis Project 1</p> <p>Master Thesis Project 1 should have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction (student has to define the research problem, research question, the aim and tasks, research object, practical and theoretical value of the topic, motives for choosing a particular topic, brief explanation of the work structure) The analysis of scientific literature and presentation of the theoretical provisions of problem solution, Outline of research methodology which addresses three questions: What do you want to determine? How will this be investigated (research model and methods)? Why are these methods the most appropriate? <p>The writing of the Master Thesis Project 1 seeks to develop the following generic and professional competences:</p> <p>Generic competences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the ability to name and explain the phenomena of business management or economics and its changes; - the ability to analyze, systematize and evaluate the obtained information and to think critically. <p>Professional competences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the ability to formulate the problems of business management or economics and to conduct the theoretical research on the topic chosen. - the skills of search for information on issue analyzed and to use it for the development of theoretical provisions; - the ability to choose and describe the methods and explain the arguments for choosing them, - the ability to summarize the findings of the theoretical research and to present conclusions and propositions. 		
Learning outcomes of the course unit (module)	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
Student will be able: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to formulate a research problem and research question; - to provide its theoretical justification and possible ways of solution; 	Independent studies of scientific literature, academic	Independent studies of scientific literature,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to critically evaluate and select the most appropriate national and international sources of information (scientific literature, databases, legal acts; - to analyse, systematise and critically evaluate economic and/or management ideas, formulate arguments and assumptions; - to systematise and evaluate information retrieved from a variety of sources in order to carry out research on selected topics - to integrate knowledge and make decisions in the absence of complete and defined information; 	advisor's consultations	academic advisor's consultations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to understand the models and interdisciplinary research methods, to know their possibilities and limitations; - to draft research model and describe the methods employed 		

Content: breakdown of the topics	Contact hours							Self-study work: time and assignments		
	Consultations	Tutorials	Seminars	Exercises	Laboratory work	Internship/work placement	E-learning	Contact hours	Self-study hours	Assignments
1. Formulation of the Master Thesis topic	1							1	10	Search and studies of the scientific literature
2. Analysis of theoretical and previous empirical researches' findings in selected topic	1							1	30	
3. Formulation of the problem, main question, the aim and objectives of the research	1							1	10	Analysis and synthesis of the information
4. Development of detailed work plan (i.e. content) of the Master Thesis including the issues to be examined in theoretical part, ideas and suggestions for the empirical analysis and the research methods (to be implemented in Master Thesis Project 2)..	0							0	34	
5. Writing Master Thesis Project 1	1							1	42	Writing a text
Total	4							4	126	

Assessment strategy	Weight, %	Assessment criteria
Introduction. Definition of the aim, objectives and the main research question	20	Student achievement assessment methods: discussion, oral and written reviewing and comments; The thesis shall be graded by the Research Project Defence Committee. Assessment criteria: 1. Aim and objectives of the thesis 2. Thesis content and structure are in line with the topic 3. Logical progression of the thesis project 4. Analysis of scientific literature is comprehensive and in line with the topic 5. Appropriateness of research research model and methods to be implemented 6. Validity of the conclusions of the literature analysis 7. List of literature sources is relevant and exhaustive 8. Language and academic style
Consistency and comprehensiveness of the scientific literature and previous empirical researches' findings analysis	60	
Appropriateness of research methods and research model		
Master Thesis Project 1 presentation	10	
Completeness, clarity, and accuracy of the answers to the questions	10	

		<p>9. Master Thesis Project 1 meets technical requirements</p> <p>Master Thesis Project 1 shall be assessed on a ten-point scale (from 5 to 10 is passed and less than 5 is not passed), according to the Assessment scale and criteria for master theses approved by the VU Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Council in 2020 July 1 electronic meeting, Minutes no. No. 210000-TP-5.</p>
--	--	---

Assessment scale and criteria for master theses

Assessment in points	Assessment criteria
Excellent (10) Rounding 9.5–10	<p>Excellent, outstanding knowledge and skills.</p> <p>The original scientific/applied research, the problem under analysis is new, unexplored, the findings are original and relevant from the point of view of theory and/or practice. The topic has been examined in detail; innovativeness, creativity, excellent knowledge, appropriate theoretical models and research methods are applied. The work is impeccable in discipline-related, methodological and technical terms. High level of defence, demonstration of deep knowledge of the field. The work can be recommended for publication in a scientific journal.</p>
Very good (9) Rounding 8.5–9.4	<p>Strong, good knowledge and skills.</p> <p>The original scientific/applied research, the problem under analysis is new, unexplored, the findings are original and relevant from the point of view of theory and/or practice. The topic has been examined in detail, innovativeness, creativity, very good knowledge, appropriate theoretical models and research methods are applied. The work has insignificant discipline-related, methodological and/or technical shortcomings and inaccuracies. The defence demonstrates very good knowledge of the field, but there are insignificant shortcomings in the defence.</p>
Good (8) Rounding 7.5–8.4	<p>Knowledge and skills are above the average.</p> <p>A comprehensive scientific/ applied research, the problem under analysis is acute, the outcomes meet the aims and objectives. The topic has been examined well and qualitatively, but not deeply enough; there is a noticeable lack of the latest theoretical and practical approaches. Appropriate theoretical models and research methods are applied; the work has discipline-related, methodological and/or technical shortcomings. The defence has demonstrated good knowledge of the field, but no comprehensive answers are received to the questions given.</p>
Highly satisfactory (7) Rounding 6.5–7.4	<p>Average knowledge and skills, there are significant errors.</p> <p>The topic has been examined, theoretical analysis and adequate research have been performed, but there is a lack of methodological justification, integrity of the work, relevance of the topic. Not all the objectives are sufficiently developed, the results lack completeness. The work has discipline-related, methodological and/or technical shortcomings. Mid-level knowledge in the field has been demonstrated in the defence.</p>
Satisfactory (6) Rounding 5.5–6.4	<p>Knowledge and abilities (skills) are worse than average, there are mistakes. The topic has been examined, but the work is incomplete, there is a lack of analysis and there are elements of descriptive work. The work lacks integrity, the relationship between the theoretical and research parts. The research has not been formulated correctly enough, there are methodological shortcomings, research methods are not properly applied. The objectives of the work are not sufficiently developed, not all the results of the work correspond to the aim and the problem of the work. The work has significant discipline-related, methodological and/or technical shortcomings. The defence demonstrates a significant lack of knowledge in the field.</p>
Sufficient (5) Rounding 4.5–5.4	<p>Knowledge and abilities (skills) meet the minimum requirements.</p> <p>The work is dominated by descriptive text. The work has significant methodological shortcomings, the aim and problem of the work are not formulated correctly, there is no adequate theoretical analysis, research methods are not properly applied. The objectives of the work are insufficiently developed, the results of the work do not sufficiently correspond to the aim and problem of the work. There are significant discipline-related, methodological and/or technical shortcomings. The defence demonstrates weak knowledge of the field.</p>
Insufficient (1, 2, 3, 4) Rounding 1–4.4	<p>Minimum requirements not met.</p> <p>The work does not clearly state the problem and/or aim of the work. The content of the work does not correspond to the title and/or aim of the work. Compilational elements of plagiarism are visible in the work. There are many significant errors, factual, methodological and/or</p>

	technical shortcomings. During the defence, the questions are not answered; a fundamental lack of knowledge in the field is demonstrated.
--	---

Author	Year of publication	Title	Issue of a periodical or volume of a publication	Publishing place and house or web link
Compulsory reading				
Prof. dr. Vytautas Dikčius, Prof. dr. Gindrutė Kasnauskienė	2019	The General Requirements of Master Thesis Preparation and Defence.	1	Economics and Business administration faculty
Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion and Keith Morrison	2018	Research Methods in Education	8 th	Routledge
Neuman L.W.	2018	Social research methods. Qualitative and quantitative approaches	7 th	Pearson
Optional reading				
ICC/ESOMAR	2008	International code of market and social research.		http://www.esomar.org/knowledge-and-standards/codes-and-guidelines.php
Hamilton, J.	1994	Time Series Analysis	1 th	Princeton University Press
Kumar, Ranjit	2019	Research methodology : a step-by-step guide for beginners	5 th	SAGE Publications
Saunders, M., Lewis P., Thornhill, A.	2018	Research methods for business students	8 th	Pearson