

**Sample #1**

**Title: EFFECTIVENESS + WHISTLEBLOWING POLICY + BOARD CHARACTERISTICS**

**Level: Master by Research (Submission Feb 2020)**

Excerpts of examiner's comments:

**2. Introduction**

**Section 1.2 Background of the study**

The **background of the study should act as a funnel** where the discussion should be made not only concerning the area that is being researched – whistleblowing behaviour and whistleblowing policy, it should also discuss **current information surrounding the area**. By being current, I would expect current studies from 2019 and 2018 range (in the field of whistleblowing behaviour and whistleblowing policy) are being incorporated into the discussion.

For this section, the candidate seemed to rely upon much of her discussion merely from old sources.

**Section 1.3 Problem statement**

1. The candidate mentioned that, "... there is a **steady growth** of research on the role of whistleblowing policy in Malaysia". However, she later argued on the need to push for such study due to, "However, studies on organisational whistleblowing policy **have been very limited**".

The above statement was certainly contradicted, especially in pushing on why such a study is worth to be conducted.

2. The candidate later ended the discussion abruptly by simply stating that studies on organisational whistleblowing policy have been very limited.

In what way was the previous studies in whistleblowing policies **were limited**? **What area of your study that you intend to examine that was not being done during the previous studies?**

In addressing the problem statement section, not only that the study needs to highlight the problem in context (what do we already know?), the discussion should also describe the precise issue that the research will address (what do we need to know?)

**Sample #2**

**Title: Fraud + Risk Assessment + Fraud Occurrences + Individual + Situational Factors + Government Auditors**

**Level: PhD (Submission June 2021)**

**3. Introduction**

**b. Item 1.3 Background of Study**

In explaining the background and the role of regional inspectorates, you are keen to base your explanations from prior research. For such an important government agency, the information should come from credible government sources e.g. websites, bulletins and the likes.

For example, I did my own search to understand the background on the role of the Regional Inspectorate as a Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) from this government source. Here is the source:

<http://inspektorat.jogjaprovo.go.id/about/>

As such, in explaining and providing the background of these regional inspectorates, it is appropriate to base from the available government sources rather than relying on previous research studies.

**c. Item 1.5 and 1.6 - RQs/ROs**

The statements for RQs and ROs are not representative of each other. You need to reword it. Furthermore, why are there 5 ROs but only 4 RQs?