

LEVEL 7 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:	LAI Koon Wing William	Student ID number:	1812889
Programme:	DBA		
Module:	Quantitative Research Methods		
Module code:	SBPD7010	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	10%
Lecturer:	Dr Andrew Chan	Internal Verifier:	
Assignment Title:	Project report, reflection and in-class test	Word count (or equivalent):	Reflection: 1000
Submission deadline:	22 April 2019	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	17 May 2019
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.		

Reflection

Developing a questionnaire was an easy job for me before I took this course. It became a super tough task now after learning deeper in this course.

I thought I was a good and efficient questionnaire developer because I could make the questions at point, collect what I wanted to collect and fulfil the purpose. It was true because I only built some questionnaires for the registration and feedback of events, I did not need the responses for an in-depth research. When I wrote the pilot test paper, I planned to adopt scales from other literatures because it was efficient and worry-free. However, when I read more and more researches, I felt more and more confused because they pointed to different directions or even opposite directions, which direction I should take was a tough decision for me. Finally, I realized that this was the exact purpose to develop a quantitative research.

Despite we were allowed to base on a small sample size of the whole class, which was composed of 20 DBA students, time was a major constraint for us. Because we needed to take this course immediately after the lectures of last course and the last course assignment topic had to be approved by the last course professor, we were working very conscientiously to satisfy the heavy demand from both courses. Fortunately, we had an excellent professor in this course who was extremely professional and ever helpful to us, so we could develop our questionnaire and collect responses very efficiently. When I was reviewing literatures, I had the difficulty that only one or two researches were related to the context, the LLC operator in Hong Kong. I spent a considerable amount of time to search but not much improvement was seemed. It meant that I had to develop something from scratch, I felt disappointed at the beginning because I could not have a sample to follow, but I felt joyful at the end because I was doing something adding value to the academic universe.

Scale development was a major part in a research. I got a member in the focus group who was a frequent flyer and took LCCs many times, she provided her insight and pointed out the future research direction. Given that the service of LCCs was limited and the flight schedule was usually inconvenient for saving their operation costs, the two strongest reasons that customers still took LCCs were the saving in air ticket price and point-to-point convenience, which FSCs might not be able to provide. As a result, the future research direction was to focus on the perceived value and repurchase intention. Other refinements of the nominal information of the respondents and addition scales of service quality, perceived value and repurchase intention were also suggested. These help my future research on this area significantly. I started learning SPSS from this course and it was just too strange

to me. In addition to the course materials and tutorial lectures, I had to search from the internet and literatures to learn more and more precisely to meet my need. Running the reliability test was not difficult but determining the dropping of scales was complicated. The pilot test followed the lecture materials' rule to drop scales which had heavy cross loading, but the result was interesting. I read through DeVellis (2012) chapters and found out there was a parallel test which used the Monte Carol simulation method to generate random samples to compare the Eigenvalues with the pilot test sample's Eigenvalues. I downloaded and corrected the syntax from the internet and applied it onto the SPSS, but the result was similar to the previous result, not much value added. Lacking a reasonable support from theories was a problem, so I tried the recommendation of Costello and Osborne (2005), to restrict the number of factors by four scenarios, i.e. 3, 4, 5 and 6 factors, but the results were still similar to the previous one. The last method I tried was to change the value of "suppressed factor loadings" of less than 0.4 to less than 0.6 and restricted the number of factors to 4 and 5, but these trials still produced the similar results. All trials concluded that there was only one underlying cause of these results – the sample size was just too small and too biased to reflect the true underlying theory.

Despite the pilot test result was not encouraging, but I learnt a lot from the pilot test, I knew how to collect sample data, develop scales, describe the nominal scales, test reliability and analyse factors through principal components analysis, scree plot, parallel test and restrict the number of factors. Before the pilot test, I did not even know the difference between scales, factors, components, oblique rotation and orthogonal rotation. I also did not know how to run some simple tests in SPSS too. Since we will have a break between April and June, I will dig deeper into the application of SPSS, especially to write the syntax rather than using the menu operation, because I found that it was quite tedious to repeat the individual test for each construct. During the pilot test, I had a sudden thought that what if the results in the pilot test were true ones, in fact there was no connection between loyalty construct and other constructs, just like what Okasha (2002) alleged that truth was not absolute, it was relative to a paradigm. At this moment, we think the finding does not make much sense, but in the future, we may change our thoughts. Human did believe the geocentric model for a very long period of time, but we proved that it was wrong later. All in all, I hoped I could apply what I learned in this course as a powerful tool to discover the truth of the academic universe.

Reference List

Costello, A. B. and Osborne, J. (2005) 'Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis', *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(7). Available at: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7>

DeVellis, F. F. (2012) *Scale Development Theory and Applications*, 3rd edn. Los Angeles: Sage

Okasha, S. (2002) *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press