

APPENDIX GA36d

LEVEL 7 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:	KAM Chi Wing	Student ID number:	1818886
Programme:	DBA		
Module:	Quantitative Research Methods		
Module code:	SBPD7010	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	100%
Lecturer:	Dr Andrew Chan	Internal Verifier:	
Assignment Title:	Project report, reflection and in-class test	Word count (or equivalent):	Reflection: 955 (+/- 10%)
Submission deadline:	April 30, 2020	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	1 June 2020
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) Alternative submission method (if applicable): Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 50%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Quantitative Research Methods

Title: Reflection

by KAM Chi Wing

Student ID: 1818886

Contents

Part 2: Reflections	3
a) Concept	3
b) Research methodology	3
c) Item and instrument development.....	3
d) Sample size	4
e) Sampling and data collection	4
f) Limitations.....	5
g) Learning process, progress.....	5
h) Future research for dissertation	5
Reference	6

Part 2: Reflections

a) Concept

Similar concepts discussed in available academic researches use different terminologies other than “Character Strengths”. The commonly used are moral character, leadership characters, leadership characteristics but the meanings are different to certain extent. The definition on the sub constructs also have variation. For example, other research studies uses commitment instead of engagement, integrity and trustworthiness instead of honesty, courage instead of bravery, etc. Some other terminology are difficult to compare e.g. some use the word “ethics”. This makes the comparison of similar research findings a challenge because the terminology used and coding applied are very different and specific.

b) Research methodology

To provide a more sounding support to the theory, future study may consider to include the qualitative research method with grounded theory. Data can be collected via semi-structured face-to-face interview. This can also help the item design and revision. More in depth analysis on the findings can be developed as well.

c) Item and instrument development

The original VIA survey design has 24 Character Strengths with 240 items. The VIA Institute on Character shorten the number of items to 72 with 3 items per Character Strength. However, it is still too much for respondent to fill in. If a portion of the 24 Characters Strengths are to be selected, the criteria for selection needed to think through. The respective research also needs to explain why some of the character strengths are not selected.

This paper study the corporate efficiency in terms of Leadership quality, Job performance of direct report, team performance, Staff engagement, Well-being, and whether there is a difference in Asian Context. To be ideal, a suite of items per construct e.g. job performance of direct reports, needed to be developed or adopted. However, there is not much suitable items available. Available and relevant suit of

items may be too comprehensive which will make the survey very long and heavy-handed.

Another concern is address suite items for the constructs will also make analysis very complicated. Comprehensive items and long survey are difficult to solicit samples. Respondents are reluctant to fill in long questionnaires. We also need to bring in different experts to validate the concept, criterion, construct of the items and scales. Such experts are also difficult to find. However, this is the area needs discussion for future items development.

There is possibility that the respondents of the survey have different perceptions towards the English description of the items. Future design of the item may consider to have a Chinese version of the items. One typical example is the understanding of character in English and Chinese has certain degree of difference, e.g. in English description, people may relate “Character” to personality, but research tells us that there is a difference between the two (Quick, Wright, 2011). In Chinese description, “Character” (i.e. 品格) has moral essence which is closer to the topic this research is trying to study. As the respondents are mainly Asian and the sample are mainly drawn from Hong Kong, including the Chinese description in the item can help the respondents to provide more accurate response. However, the mechanism of selecting English or Chinese version to the targeting samples needed to figure out. Bilingual survey may make the survey too long to read.

d) Sample size

The sample size (i.e. 25), of this pretest was very small. The analysis and interpretation of the data can be very subjective, especially when the representation is not board enough.

e) Sampling and data collection

Majority of this pre-test sample is male (i.e. 80%), future study may need to ensure a fair balance of males and females for data collection and analysis. If future research is continue study the constructs in Asian context, certain measures are needed ensure different countries of data are collected. Alternatives may includes

focusing the data collection from certain countries e.g. Hong Kong, China, Taiwan, Singapore, etc. As many companies are cross countries, another alternative is to collect data from different categories of firms e.g. Multinational, Regional (Asia only) firms. China national firms, Hong Kong local enterprise, Non-profit making firms. We can also categorize the sample according to the size of corporations e.g. large corporates, small and medium enterprise, etc.

f) Limitations

Although there are rising discussion on character strength in recent years, the available qualitative, and quantitative research are still very limited. This makes the theory foundation and the empirical reference for this research considered thin. However, from a different angle, this can be seen as future research opportunities and this makes the study of related topic valuable.

g) Learning process, progress

This is a very valuable learning process. This assignment give me to think through the items design and future plan for sample collection. The academic expert also provided very valuable feedback on the item development.

h) Future research for dissertation

For future research and preparation of the dissertation, more literatures needed to be done on the definition of characters, leadership, performance, staff engagement, well-being, etc. After reading those researches, narrow down and focus on one or two constructs e.g. performance and staff engagement. I can also explore other items besides the Value in Action (VIA) assessment survey used in this pretest.

I also need to build more ground for studying the topic in Asian Context. For example, Asia will contribute to 50 percent of total global GDP by 2040 (Tonby, 2019). If empirical evidence can be drawn that character has a significant impact on individual and business and outcome, the findings can help corporates in corporate strategy and leadership development. The findings can also help

organisations to avoid unnecessary business risk caused by human which also benefit our society as whole.

Reference

Tonby et al., 2019. Asia is Future Now , *Discussion Paper*, McKinsey & Company,