

DBA Regulations, Assessment Criteria, and Samples

A. Doctorates and doctoral opportunities	1
B. Doctoral Board	1
C. Evaluation Board	1
D. Supervisory arrangements	2
E. Supervision Management	2
a. The Student's Responsibilities	2
b. The Supervisor's Responsibilities	2
F. Doctoral Procedure	3
G. Doctoral Assessment and Progress Review	5
H. Annual Progress Review	6
I. Basis of Award of Doctoral Degree	7
J. Dissertation	7
K. Examination of the Dissertation	7
L. Defense/ Viva voce	8
M. Outcomes of the Programme Evaluation:	8
N. Opportunities for Students Scoring 40–59 and Below 40 in the DBA Program	9
Exit Awards	10
O. The Doctoral Award	11
P. Award titles	11
Annexure A: Grading Criteria for Level 8 Coursework	13
Annexure B: Level 8 Grading Criteria for Viva/ defense	16
Annexure C: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 1	18
Annexure D: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 2: Research Proposal	20
Annexure E: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 3: Final Dissertation	22
Annexure F: Suggested Chapterisation and Sample Dissertation formats:	27

A. Doctorates and doctoral opportunities

- a. EU Global awards the Doctoral Degree “Doctor of Business Administration in chosen specialisation” or general “Doctor of Business Administration” in short DBA/ DBA in Specialization, on the basis of a proper doctoral procedure.
- b. EU Global doctorate is an accredited university degree and is awarded depending on the doctoral candidate's specialisation.

B. Doctoral Board

- a. The Doctoral Board at EU Global comprises the DBA Programme Leader, CoSR Chair (DBA Coordinator), Supervisor. The Doctoral evaluation Board, in addition to the above, also includes at least two independent examiners, of whom at least one must be an External Examiner.
- b. The DBA Programme Leader and CoSR Chair, both also qualified to be the Supervisor are responsible for ensuring compliance with the doctoral regulations and has rights to information and authority to issue instructions to all committees and parties involved in doctoral matters.
- c. Separate Doctoral and evaluation Board is selected for each Cohort of Doctoral Candidates. Normally, six Doctoral candidates are allocated, but in any case, not more than nine candidates are allocated to one committee.
- d. The Board members are obliged to maintain confidentiality of their proceedings with the Doctoral Candidates.
- e. The decisions of the board are collated by CoSR and CoSR communicates to the Doctoral Candidates.

C. Evaluation Board

- a. The Evaluation Board must be made up of at least two independent examiners, of whom at least one must be an External Examiner. External Examiner must be independent of the student, the Institution, and any collaborating establishment. Any person appointed as External Examiner must not have been employed by the Institute during the previous three years.
- b. CoRS must submit details of a proposed Evaluation Board which will assess the thesis or portfolio and critical overview and examine the student through a viva voce. These details must be submitted a minimum of three months in advance of the proposed date of the viva voce.
- c. Each examiner must be experienced in research in the general subject area of a particular student's thesis or portfolio and critical overview and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.

D. Supervisory arrangements

- a. DBA Scholars undertaking will have a supervisory or advisory team consisting of at least one but normally no more than two supervisors.

- b. All supervisors must be on the Institute's Research Degree Supervisors, with the exception of an "external supervisor", who is also to be approved by the Institute.
- c. One cohort of Doctoral Research (recommended six, not more than nine Doctoral Candidates) must be designated as the Coordinator of Research Studies (CoRS) who is qualified to be a Supervisor and an expert in research design. The CoRS will normally be the primary supervisor for research scholars, responsible for overseeing student progress, managing supervisory relations and ensuring the student complies with regulatory requirements and relevant processes.
- d. No Supervisor will be allocated more than nine research scholars for supervision, unless the supervisor is designated a full time role for Supervision.

E. Supervision Management

a. The Student's Responsibilities

- i. Reading and putting into practice the guidance in the handbook (noting in particular information on record-keeping and assessment).
- ii. Observing health and safety, data protection and ethical protocols, including completion of documents related to ethics approval.
- iii. Planning and managing the time commitment required of the module/Project/ Dissertation.
- iv. Initiating and agreeing a written plan of work and a timetable of meetings with their supervisor.
- v. Keeping a Project diary or log-book as a means of monitoring progress and recording the outcomes of meetings.
- vi. Discussing progress with their supervisor and responding to guidance and constructive criticism, and understanding that the supervisor should not be expected to predict the grade for the Dissertation or Project.

b. The Supervisor's Responsibilities

- i. Advising on the student's work plan and agreeing a schedule of meetings (which can be virtual or face-to-face), and responsibilities in initiating and recording the outcome of meetings.
- ii. Ensuring that students are aware of the role of the supervisor and the anticipated extent of support in terms of providing direction, time allocated to meetings, reading and commenting on drafts, etc.
- iii. Monitoring student progress and providing timely, honest and constructive feedback, and following up non-attendance at scheduled meetings.
- iv. Keeping a brief record of meetings and student progress.
- v. Complying with policy on providing feedback on draft text, which is normally that a supervisor will read and comment on one draft of specific sections of the Dissertation /Project provided it is submitted for comment within a reasonable time ahead of the submission deadline.
- vi. Being familiar with the formal assessment procedures and criteria.

F. Doctoral Procedure

- a. Doctoral Candidates attend the Doctoral programme, participate in the coursework, successfully clear the milestone assessments and submit and defend the final Dissertation.
- b. EU Global DBA programme comprises eight modules and three residencies to be delivered within the entire duration of the programme. Most modules are planned to be delivered in asynchronous manner with at least two Masterclasses for application. Residencies are scheduled with Doctoral Board participation to provide both collative information at the Programme Leader level regarding Milestone expectation and requirement, at same time personal supervision by the Supervisor to help reach individual Milestone assessment. The residencies also allow pre-Milestone submission comprehensive feedback opportunities in presence of at least one external evaluator.
- c. The EU Global DBA programme is classified into three stages -
 - i. **Stage 1 - Exploring Research Problem:** DBA Candidates study two modules and participate in one residency. This stage allows identifying the Research problem, that reflects upon the Scholars experience, and recommendations worth implementing into their professional practice, generating value to stakeholders value. This stage ends with **Milestone 1: Professional Reflection, Draft Research proposal and its application to practice:** This milestone allows Scholars to ensure that they formulate research problems that meet the requirements of their DBA studies. DBA Scholars must successfully submit and defend Milestone 1 before progressing to Stage 2.
 - ii. **Stage 2: Proposal Phase DBA Candidates study two modules** - Literature Review and Advanced Research Methodology and attend one Residency on Academic Publication. The Academic publication residency is followed by a Scholars' Research **Conclave** where external auditors of Research Journals are invited as one of the evaluators, to get comprehensive feedback on Scholars Research proposal before final submission of Milestone 2. Post which, Candidates attempt Milestone 2 Assessment: **Research Proposal and Defense. Milestone 2: Research Proposal and Defense:** Post completing the introduction, literature review and advanced research methodology module, the Scholars now had spent adequate time to delineate their research variable, reasoning, alignment with methodology, etc and now have better clarity on their conceptual model. Scholars defend it to the Doctoral Board so that they can move to the Stage 3, Dissertation Phase.
 - iii. **Stage 3: Dissertation Phase.** The Candidates conduct further research on their proposal in terms of data collection, analysis, interpretation, drawing conclusions and recommendations and application to practice. The pre-dissertation defense is presented in an Internal **Conference**, again with the participation of externals, also renowned editorial board members of reputed Journal to allow Scholars comprehensive feedback on their Final Dissertation. Stage 3 culminates in the final **Milestone 3: Dissertation Submission and defense**, which is the final outcome of the DBA programme.
- d. EU Global DBA Coursework is designed to help Scholars progress towards their Dissertation from its inception. The assessments of the coursework later become a part of the final dissertation, hence not pressuring or deviating Scholars.
- e. Most Module and residencies of 8 weeks comprises of following assessment components, the one of 4 weeks does not have an interim assessment:
 - i. **Weekly Formative Submissions/Discussions:** These brief submissions allow scholars to seek progressive feedback from faculty, facilitating continuous improvement and engagement with the course material. They are designed

- to help students refine their understanding and enhance the quality of their work for subsequent assessments.
 - ii. **Summative Interim Assessment:** This assessment evaluates scholars' progress at a defined midpoint in the module. It encourages a deeper exploration of the content and provides an opportunity for comprehensive feedback, which can be integrated into future work.
 - iii. **Summative End-of-the-Module Assessment:** This final assessment consolidates the learning from the module, requiring scholars to demonstrate their understanding and application of the material comprehensively. The insights gained from weekly submissions and the interim assessment contribute to the quality and depth of this culminating assessment.
- f. After each module, DBA scholars are given an 8-week self-study period, starting from Residency 1, to engage in developmental work. During this time, they collaborate closely with their supervisors, reflecting on the module content and their professional practice. Scholars are expected to incorporate feedback from module tutors on their weekly submissions and interim assessments, using these insights to enhance the final end-of-module assessments. This period encourages deep reflection, personal learning, and the refinement of written components related to their module topics, fostering continuous improvement and practical application in their ongoing research and professional roles.
- g. Each module assessment is designed to facilitate progression toward the dissertation, starting from module one. Formative feedback on weekly assessments and interim assessments is provided by the module tutor, who guides scholars throughout the learning process. The end-of-module assessment is evaluated by the module faculty and undergoes a double marking process by the Supervisor or another faculty member to ensure objectivity and rigour.
- h. Residencies offer scholars intensive learning experiences and are managed by a diverse team from the EU Global Doctoral Research Team, rather than relying solely on one module tutor. For example, the DBA Coordinator is tasked with clarifying submission requirements, while Supervisors work closely with individual students to enhance their drafts. In addition, external editorial members participate in conclaves to provide valuable feedback to scholars, and external evaluators may be present during presentations in other residency sessions. The CoSR Chair is also responsible for delivering consolidated feedback to scholars prior to their milestone submissions, ensuring that they receive comprehensive support throughout their academic journey. This collaborative approach enhances the quality of feedback and enriches the overall learning experience for DBA students.
- i. Scholars must note that they need to be mindful of consideration for Ethics and application to practice in business administration throughout the study.
- j. Scholars are at times required to present their work. These are intended to present and defend progress towards final dissertation, and prepare for defense.

G. Doctoral Assessment and Progress Review

- a. Coursework is assessed on the basis of submission of interim and end-of-the module assessment. The weightage and requirement of the assessment is most 20% for interim and 80% for final, further categorised in presentation and report. The word count, submission deadline, and requirements are clearly mentioned in the assessment handbook, disseminated and uploaded on e-campus. The coursework is taught in a modular manner and the assignments are placed in respective

progression blocks on e-campus, with all requirements clearly mentioned. The Assessment Handbook is also disseminated upfront so that the Candidates start to work on submission while studying the coursework.

- b. Candidates are advised to keep their research work confidential from peer groups, and DO NOT share their work in group forums or for any reference. While we promote peer-to-peer interaction, submitting their main work on a forum can lead to plagiarism. We recommend employing peer to peer interaction and learning for productive discussions and presentations, but not submitting their written work in a public forum.
- c. The weekly feedback and interim and end-of-the-module coursework is evaluated by the module tutor, the end-of-the-module assessment is double evaluated by the Supervisor as well.
- d. The Milestone assessment is evaluated by the Doctoral Board - The Programme Leader, Supervisor and at least one external report of which is compiled by CoSR and shared with the Candidates.
- e. The submission and presentation in Residencies provide an opportunity for pre-milestone comprehensive feedback, the feedback is expected to be incorporated in the Milestone submission.
- f. Each assessment rubric is given towards the end of this document.
- g. The Candidate must successfully pass the modules and residencies coursework before attempting the Milestone. If the Candidate hasn't attempted or failed or was found to do substantial improvement, he/she will not be allowed to attempt the Milestone following that coursework during the former Stage.
- h. **Resit:** In accordance with the EU Global Resit regulations, Candidates are given a second attempt of an assessment component within a course, following failure at first attempt. Attending classes is not required for the Resit examination. The resit submission is generally expected within 2 weeks of declaration of result or as agreed with Supervisor and CoSR Chair in case of Doctoral Scholars. Resit can be taken only for a failed component and an individual passed component is not required to be appeared again. The grades of passed components can be carried forward. A third Resit attempt is possible in case of extenuating circumstances.
- i. **Retake** – a third attempt of all assessment components within a course following failure at the first or resit attempts. Retake of the failed component may require the student to participate in classes to prepare them for the second attempt.
- j. The coursework, its submission and presentation assessment and milestone and its defense has provided Scholars adequate opportunity to progress towards the final dissertation. Resit and retake options are also applicable for defense.
- k. EU Global does not mandate its DBA scholars to publish in Journals, though it recommends and provides adequate knowledge and support to publish. The Candidates who publish in a reputable journal gets straight $\frac{1}{6}$ grades towards final dissertation dedicated for coursework, as publication in a reputable journal is a benchmark for their strength in research methodology. CoSR can review the Journal reputation upon request. A reputable journal can be defined by the following key criteria:
 - i. **Peer-Reviewed Process:** Ensures that articles are reviewed by experts in the field, maintaining quality and reliability.
 - ii. **Indexed in Major Databases:** Inclusion in databases like Scopus, Web of Science, or Google Scholar, which signifies research impact and accessibility.
 - iii. **Impact Factor or Similar Metrics:** A measurable impact factor (IF) or similar citation metrics reflect the journal's influence and scholarly reputation.

iv. **Affiliation with a Recognized Institution or Publisher:** Association with respected academic bodies or publishers like Elsevier, Taylor & Francis, or Springer enhances journal credibility.

H. Annual Progress Review

- a. In addition to the coursework and Milestone review, all students will be subject to an Annual Progress Review (APR), the first of which will take place no later than 12 months after initial registration for research students and 12 months after entering the “Dissertation stage” for research students then every 12 months thereafter until the submission of the Dissertation.
- b. In case of study break, the interim review must be completed within 6 months of their return to study.
- c. For the purposes of the review, the student and Supervisor or CoSR Chair must submit a set of documentation appropriate to their year and mode of study to the doctoral board.
- d. The student’s progress and standard of work, including their technical proficiency in the English language, is at or above expectations; the Candidate may progress and no further action is required.

Annual Progress Review	No further action required	Scholar is required to provide a written response to the feedback on the way to clarify outstanding issues	Scholar is required to schedule meeting with either Supervisor or recommended professor such as academic coach as recommended
Student’s progress and standard of work	The progress is at or above expectations	The progress is at or above expectations but some outstanding issues remaining	The progress is below expectation
Technical proficiency in the Academic writing	The progress is at or above expectations	The progress is at or above expectations but some outstanding issues remaining	The progress is below expectation

- e. In those instances where the Board required a response, it will consider the student’s responses to the actions specified and may recommend the following to the Research Degrees Board: a. The student has responded satisfactorily to the actions specified and no further action is required. b. The student has not responded satisfactorily to the actions specified and should be given a specified timeframe to provide a further response to the Board.

- f. If the Board deems that this further response is not satisfactory, the Panel may recommend that the student must withdraw from the programme.
- g. Where a student does not respond in the stated time frame without explanation at either stage set out above, the case will be forwarded to the Academic Disciplinary committee.
- h. The above feedback is to be provided in written mode, on which both the Supervisor and Scholar are required to provide feedback and suggest a plan of action if required and sign off.

I. Basis of Award of Doctoral Degree

- a. The doctorate Award is conferred based on participation in the doctoral program-coursework and the successful submission and defense of an independently authored dissertation. The Candidate should have attained the required grades successfully.
- b. The Dissertation is always an individual achievement.
- c. If ethical conflicts arise in a dissertation, the CoSR Chair must organise an ethics meeting with the doctoral candidate and if needed, along with the Supervisor. In this meeting, they address the ethical concerns and aim to balance the rights to professional autonomy and research freedom by reaching a consensus among all parties involved. The meeting should conclude with clear recommendations to resolve or mitigate the conflicts.
- d. The Research Scholar must be able to respond to the recommendations within the stipulated time period allocated by the CoSR Chair.

J. Dissertation

- a. The dissertation must demonstrate an original contribution to the field of business administration, showcasing innovative insights or practical applications relevant to industry practice.
- b. Dissertation is an individually produced HandBook.
- c. EU Global Dissertation can be submitted in English Language only.
- d. The standard number of words is 60,000, but at least 50,000 words, which must be justified in an appropriate manner and quality.
- e. In addition to the text section and the table of contents and bibliography, the dissertation is in an electronic form via e-campus.

K. Examination of the Dissertation

- a. Each examiner is required to read and assess the Dissertation and critical overview and to submit an independent preliminary report to the Institute before any viva voce or alternative form of examination is held on the rubric provided by the Institute; to this end examiners should not meet to discuss and critical overview prior to submission of the preliminary report. As part of that assessment, each examiner must consider whether the thesis satisfies the Institute's requirements for the degree concerned, including technical proficiency in the English language, and, where possible, make an appropriate provisional decision, subject to the outcome of the viva voce examination.

L. Defense/ Viva voce

- a. The candidate must present the results achieved with the dissertation in front of the appointed evaluation board, which may not exceed 25 minutes, and answer questions. It should not exceed 30 minutes.
- b. Viva Voce is coordinated by CoRS.
- c. CoRS is not required to read the thesis or portfolio and critical overview or complete a preliminary report form and should be seen as totally independent throughout the process.
- d. Prior to the viva voce, the CoRS is expected to brief the examiners on the Institution's procedures and facilitate the development of an agenda if requested by the examiners.
- e. A supervisor or advisor is allowed, subject to the consent of the student, to attend the viva voce as an observer; participation in the discussion, however, is not permitted.
- f. All evaluators are required to fill in the Institutions rubric form and submit it to CoSR.
- g. A failed defense can be repeated at the candidate's request within one year.

M. Outcomes of the Programme Evaluation:

- a. Following grading system is employed for various components.

- i. **Coursework, Viva and Milestone 1 and Milestone 2:** The mentioned Doctoral assessments will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100.

85 to 100	Excellent
70 to 84	Good
60 to 69	Developing
40 to 59	Need Improvement
below 40	Not Acceptable

The Candidates scoring 60 and above progresses and are eligible to attempt the Milestone and scorers between 40-59 are recommended to work closely with their Supervisors and work on feedback. 50 and below will have an opportunity to resit and retake.

ii. **Milestone 3: Dissertation**

The final Dissertation and passing grade is calculated on a scale of 0-100 as follows:

Dissertation Report - $\frac{2}{3}$

Dissertation defense - $\frac{1}{6}$
Coursework or Publication - $\frac{1}{6}$

Publication in a reputed journal as described above will result in 100% contribution towards Coursework or Publication grade of $\frac{1}{6}$. Either it will be $\frac{1}{6}$ for a reputed Journal publication or average score of all coursework to date.

The final result on the total calculated grade will be classified as follows:

85 to 100	Distinction and clear pass
70 to 84	Good Pass, Pass with revisions that need to be approved by the Supervisor and CoSR Chair only.
60 to 69	Pass, Pass with revisions that need to be approved by the CoSR Chair and Evaluation Board members.
40 to 59	The student needs to resit, retake or exit with MPhil (Master of Philosophy) Level 7
below 40	Fail- resit, retake or exit with no qualification

- Please note that if Candidates scoring 60-84 does not review and incorporate feedback and seek further approval within stipulated time period, as approved by CoSR also considering extenuating circumstances, they will have to exit with MPhil (Master of Philosophy) Level 7. They will be given only one attempt to resubmit their work.
- The decision on the overall grade is made by the Doctoral Board on the recommendation of the Evaluation Board .

N. Opportunities for Students Scoring 40–59 and Below 40 in the DBA Program

1. Students Scoring 40–59

Students scoring 40–59 have demonstrated limited achievement of DBA-level outcomes in the respective module or the overall dissertation but possess sufficient knowledge and skills to meet the requirements for a Master's degree. These students are offered the following opportunities:

- **One Resit Opportunity:** Students may resubmit their dissertation or revise specific components where weaknesses were identified. Detailed feedback from the examination panel will guide improvements.
- **Eligibility for Retake:** If the resit does not lead to acceptable improvement, students are eligible for a full retake, requiring re-enrollment in the dissertation component/module, conducting additional research, and addressing deficiencies. Institutional retake policies, such as applicable fees, will apply.

- **Academic Support:** During resits or retakes, students will have access to additional supervisory sessions, workshops, and tutorials to address gaps in critical analysis, methodological design, or other areas identified in their assessment.
- **Scoring 40–59% After Retakes:** Students scoring between 40–59 in individual components may only resit or retake modules. If they fail to meet the required standards or exit the program before completion, they will not receive any award.

Exit Awards

1. Exit Without an Award

- Students scoring below 59 in modules/milestones or below 40 in all components, including the dissertation and defense, after exhausting resit and retake attempts, will exit the program without an award. Unfortunately, the module individual credits cannot be awarded at a Doctorate Level.
- These students may be advised to re-enroll in the program or pursue alternative credentials.

2. Exit With an Award (MPhil)

- Students passing modules and milestones with scores of 60 and above; but scoring 50–59 in the overall dissertation and defense (after resit and retake) will be awarded a Master's in Philosophy (MPhil) at a pass level.
- This award acknowledges their efforts and ensures they leave the program with a credential. Note that the MPhil will only be granted as a pass-level.

2. Students Scoring Below 40 (Fail)

Students scoring below 40 have not met the minimum standards for either a DBA or Master's degree. These students are offered the following options:

- **Resit Opportunity:** Students may resubmit their dissertation after making substantial improvements based on detailed feedback, subject to institutional policies and the nature of the deficiencies.
- **Retake of Component:** Students may re-enroll for a full retake, conducting new or significantly revised research. This opportunity allows them to demonstrate improvement and meet required standards.
- **Guidance and Support:** Students will receive tailored academic support, including additional supervisory hours, skill-development workshops, and resources like writing or research methodology training to address critical deficiencies.
- **Pathway to Alternative Credentials:** If students fail to meet required standards after resit or retake attempts, they may be guided toward other credentials or professional development programs aligned with their demonstrated capabilities.
- **Failed Attempts Post Resit and Retake:** Students who fail resit and retake attempts will exit the program without an award.

General Notes for Both Categories

- **Limitations on Attempts:** Students are permitted one resit and one retake for the dissertation component, per program regulations.
- **Clear Communication:** Students will be informed of their options, timelines for resits and retakes, and the support available to them.
- **Academic Integrity:** All opportunities are provided in compliance with academic standards, ensuring that awarded qualifications reflect the student's actual achievements and capabilities.

O. The Doctoral Award

- a. The award of the doctoral degree following a successfully completed doctoral procedure is based on a decision by the Evaluation Board. The Director of the Doctoral School must notify the candidate of the decision to award the doctorate in writing.
- b. The doctoral degree certificate is awarded when all requirements for the award of the doctoral degree have been met in accordance with these doctoral degree regulations.
- c. The right to use the doctoral title in the forms begins with the award of the doctoral certificate.

P. Award titles

For DBA or doctoral Research, the award title will be

General DBA, for instance

Programme Title - Doctor of Business Administration
Thesis Title

OR

Programme Title in Specialisation
Thesis title

For instance,

Doctor of Business Administration in Accounting & Finance

A study of determinants of underpricing of the Initial Public Offerings in Germany from 2015-2024

I. What is required to be done to claim Specialisation?

DBA scholars can claim a specialisation in the title to their DBA title if they meet all of the following criteria.

- The scholar may request their DBA title with a specific specialisation if they have either completed a Master's degree in the relevant field or possess a minimum of 10 years of professional experience at a managerial level within the same specialisation in which DBA Dissertation is pursued. Additionally, their doctoral research should align with this area of expertise to ensure consistency and depth in the chosen specialisation.

Annexure A: Grading Criteria for Level 8 Coursework

Level 8 Grading Criteria: Following criteria will be followed for **Level 8 coursework** unless a specified criteria for a particular component is provided.

Title of Assessment:

Student's Name :

Enrolment No :

Cohort:

Criteria	weightage	Excellent (85 to 100)	Good (70 to 84)	Developing (60 to 69)	Needs Improvement (40 to 59)	Not Acceptable (below 40)	Total
Knowledge	20%	Excellent and abundant evidence of meeting the respective module's knowledge based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Good evidence of meeting the respective module's knowledge based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Sound evidence of meeting the respective module's knowledge based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Adequate knowledge of the respective module's knowledge based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme, but require some improvement to achieve doctoral level.	Not enough projection on achievement of the respective module's knowledge based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	
Skills	20%	Excellent and abundant	Good evidence of meeting the	Sound evidence of meeting the	Adequate knowledge of the	Not enough projection on	

		evidence of meeting the respective module's skills based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	respective module's skills based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	respective module's skills based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	respective module's skills based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme but require some improvement to achieve doctoral level.	achievement of the respective module's skills based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	
Competencies	20%	Excellent and abundant evidence of meeting the respective module's competencies based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Good evidence of meeting the respective module's competencies based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Sound evidence of meeting the respective module's competencies based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	Adequate knowledge of the respective module's competencies based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme but require some improvement to achieve doctoral level.	Not enough projection on achievement of the respective module's competencies based learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.	
Ethics and Professionalism	20%	Integrate or exemplify excellent awareness of advanced ethical considerations and its application into	Exemplify good awareness of advanced ethical considerations and its application into	Exemplify sound awareness of advanced ethical considerations and its relevance into	Exemplify basic awareness of ethical considerations and its relevance into the research	Lacks awareness of ethical considerations and its relevance into the research	

		its implementation into the research aspects in question, showing professionalism and a commitment to integrity.	the research aspects in question, with minor areas for further enhancement though projecting a commitment to integrity.	the research aspects in question, though integration or its knowledge may lack depth or consistency.	aspects in question, indicating the need for further understanding and application of ethics in research and practice.	aspects in question, indicating the greater need for developing understanding and application of ethics in research and practice.	
		Confidence in the selection and interpretation of reading including texts outside the module materials	Good selection and interpretation of reading including sources outside the module materials.	A sound range and interpretation of reading	An appropriate selection of reading.	A limited or none selection of reading	
Academic structure	20%	Logical, coherent and cohesive discussion or argument relevant to the requirements of the assignment	A thoughtful, well-structured discussion or argument relevant to the requirements of the assignment.	A well developed, balanced description or discussion relevant to the requirements of the assignment.	Few irrelevancies in a description or discussion about the requirements of the assignment.	Irrelevancies in a description or discussion about the requirements of the assignment	
		Evidence of reflection, independent thought and judgement in answering the question	A balanced, reflective and well-considered answer to the question.	A well-structured, reflective answer to the question	An adequate answer to the question	A partial or fully irrelevant answer to the question	
			Clear, coherent and articulate writing	Clear and coherent writing	Mainly clear and coherent writing	Some incoherent, unclear, unstructured writing	
				Minor inconsistencies in academic referencing, but require substantial improvement.	Minor inconsistencies academic referencing, but require substantial improvement.	Inconsistent and incorrect academic referencing	

		articulate writing Faultless use of academic referencing	correct academic referencing				
--	--	---	------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Annexure B: Level 8 Grading Criteria for Viva/ defense

Following criteria will be followed for **Level 8 viva/ presentation/defense** unless a specified criteria for a particular component is provided.

Title of Assessment:

Student's Name :

Enrolment No :

Cohort:

Criteria	%	Excellent 85 to 100	Good 70 to 84	Developing 60 to 69	Need Improvement 40 to 59	Not Acceptable below 40	Scored
----------	---	---------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--------

Defending meeting the requirements for assignment	20%	<p>Assignment Requirements – in terms of content, coverage, practice focus, word length and submission due dates – are met and defended in a meticulous and thorough way.</p> <p>Excellent and abundant evidence of defending meeting the module learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.</p> <p>Exceed expectation in incorporating the feedback provided in previous or interim assessments conducted before this assessment.</p>	<p>Assignment Requirements – in terms of content, coverage, practice focus, word length and submission due dates – are met and defended in a thorough way</p> <p>Good evidence of defending meeting the module learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.</p> <p>Implement feedback effectively, showcasing clear improvements and thoughtful responses to critiques, but with few areas lacking refinement.</p>	<p>Assignment Requirements – in terms of content, coverage, practice focus, word length and submission due dates – are met and defended in a competent way</p> <p>Sound evidence of defending meeting the module learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.</p> <p>Address feedback adequately with some improvements evident in the submission. However, the application of feedback may lack depth or comprehensive integration.</p>	<p>Assignment Requirements – in terms of content, coverage, practice focus, word length and submission due dates – are met and defended in just enough way</p> <p>Adequate knowledge of the defending module learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.</p> <p>Address feedback barely with little improvements evident in the submission. However, the application of feedback lack depth or comprehensive integration with substantial improvements required in work.</p>	<p>Assignment Requirements – in terms of content, coverage, practice focus, word length and submission due dates – are barely met and found hard to defend.</p> <p>Not enough projection on achievement of the module learning outcomes at the required level of the programme.</p> <p>Acknowledge feedback in a limited capacity, with minimal evidence of integration in the submission.</p> <p>Improvements are not clearly defined, and the work shows little effort to address previous critiques.</p>
Outcomes, research inquiry and ethics	20%	<p>Comprehensive, in-depth knowledge of the module outcomes.</p> <p>Present new perspectives by synthesising advanced theories within business contexts, demonstrating both depth of understanding and innovative application.</p> <p>Thoroughly justifies research methodological choices, explaining alignment with inquiry goals and industry standards.</p>	<p>Wide ranging, detailed knowledge of the module outcomes.</p> <p>Present analysis and critical assessment of a range of theories, showing proficiency in understanding and applying complex business principles.</p>	<p>Secure knowledge of the module materials.</p> <p>Demonstrate a solid grasp of relevant theories and principles, though innovation and advanced comprehension may be underdeveloped.</p>	<p>Enough knowledge of the module materials</p> <p>Recall and present basic concepts with limited critical evaluation, indicating a need for further engagement with advanced materials.</p>	<p>Some or no knowledge of the module materials.</p> <p>Some or no understanding of theory, issues and debates.</p> <p>Some or no evidence of applying academic study to practise examples.</p>
		<p>Demonstrates a strong ethical stance, addressing biases, assumptions, and data privacy concerns.</p>	<p>Provides rationale for research design, though minor details could improve clarity.</p>	<p>Provides adequate rationale for research design, though minor details are required to improve clarity.</p>	<p>Justification for methodology is somewhat present but lacks alignment with goals.</p>	

Professional Communication and Engagement	20%	Communicates with authority, maintaining a professional tone and engaging the audience actively. Demonstrates excellent verbal clarity, confidence, and responsiveness. Logical comprehension of content, its evidence, analysis and conclusions communicated in a meticulous and thorough way.	Communicates clearly and professionally, engaging the audience well, though minor improvements in delivery could enhance presence. Logical comprehension of content, its evidence, analysis and conclusions communicated in a thorough way.	Communicates adequately and professionally, engaging the audience just enough, though improvements in delivery could enhance presence. Logical comprehension of content, its evidence, analysis and conclusions communicated in a competent way.	Communicates adequately but lacks full engagement or occasional lapses in clarity. Logical comprehension of content, its evidence, analysis and conclusions communicated just enough.	Struggles with communication clarity, minimal audience engagement, or lacks professional tone. Logical comprehension of content, its evidence, analysis and conclusions communication flow is lacking.
Visual Aids, Data Visualization & Structure	20%	Visuals are meticulously designed, highly relevant, and improve comprehension of complex data or concepts. Effective use of graphs, charts, or models that reinforce key points.	Visual aids are well-designed, relevant, and support the presentation effectively, though minor improvements in clarity or alignment could be made.	Visual aids are appropriately designed, relevant, and support the presentation effectively, though minor improvements in clarity or alignment are essential.	Visuals are basic but adequate; add some value though lack relevance, minor improvements are mandatory.	Visual aids are unclear, irrelevant, or distracting from the presentation's main points.
Response to Questions Asked	20%	Answers are insightful, detailed, and accurate, showcasing a meticulous and thorough understanding of knowledge and critical thinking.	Answers are clear, relevant, and accurate, showcasing a thorough understanding of knowledge and critical thinking.	Answers are adequately clear, relevant, and accurate, showcasing a competent understanding of knowledge and critical thinking, but with minor improvements required	Answers are adequate enough, somewhat relevant and accurate, but lack a thorough understanding of knowledge and critical thinking, and require major improvements.	Responses are incomplete, lack accuracy, or show limited understanding of the question's core issues.
Total	100%					

Annexure C: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 1

Milestone 1: Professional Reflection, Draft Research proposal and its application to practice

Title of Assessment:

Student's Name :

Enrolment No :

Cohort:

Criteria	% 100	Good 70 to 84		Developing 60 to 69		Need Improvement 40 to 59		Not Acceptable below 40		Scored
		Excellent 85 to 100	70 to 84	Developing 60 to 69	Need Improvement 40 to 59	Not Acceptable below 40				
Reflection and research gap	10%	Provides an excellent reflection on background; offers critically synthesised analysis with a clear connection to the research gap in their respective field.	Provides a thoughtful reflection on background; offers good analysis with adequate connection to the research gap in their respective field.	Provides a basic reflection on background; offers some analysis with limited connection to the research gap in their respective field.	Provides a minimal reflection on background; offers limited analysis with limited connection to the research gap in their respective field.	Lacks a minimal reflection on background; offers no clear analysis with lacking connection to the research gap in their respective field.				
Problem Definition & Research Questions	20%	Conceptualises an original, impactful problem and formulates clear, researchable questions; demonstrates high potential for advancing knowledge in business administration.	Defines a clear, researchable problem; research questions are relevant, feasible, and aligned with DBA goals.	Defines a clear, researchable problem; research questions are relevant but with minor improvement, feasible, and still aligned with DBA goals.	Defines a basic problem; research questions are present but may lack clarity or strong alignment with DBA objectives.	Problem statement is unclear or lacks relevance; research questions are vague or missing.				
Evidence and Contextual Understanding	20%	Evaluates relevant evidence critically, presenting a strong theoretical foundation; integrates multiple perspectives effectively and justifies research gaps.	Identifies relevant evidence and justifies the research context; demonstrates basic understanding of theoretical frameworks.	Identifies relevant evidence and justifies the research context; demonstrates basic understanding of theoretical frameworks.	Evidence review is limited in scope; some understanding of context, but gaps in analysis and integration.	Minimal or incomplete review of evidence; lacks clear connection to research context or gaps.				
Methodology and Ethical Considerations	20%	Comprehensively evaluates a wide range of research methods, demonstrating sophisticated insight into the advantages, limitations, and ethical dimensions. Exhibits deep understanding of how these aspects align with research questions, reflecting critical thinking and nuanced analysis.	Thoroughly analyzes multiple research methods, showing clear understanding of strengths, limitations, and ethical considerations. Demonstrates well-developed reasoning on the suitability of each method for answering specific research questions.	Effectively discusses relevant research methods, identifying major strengths, limitations, and ethical issues. Shows logical thinking on how different methods might support or challenge research objectives, though may lack depth in certain areas.	Adequately describes key research methods with basic attention to strengths, weaknesses, and ethics. Displays some understanding of methods' relevance to research questions but lacks detailed reflection or critical depth.	Limited reflection on research methods, with minimal attention to strengths, limitations, and ethical concerns. Shows little connection between methods and research questions, with few insights into the pros and cons of different approaches.				

Conclusion and Application to Practice	20%	Propose practical, innovative applications with substantial relevance to professional practice; demonstrates strategic insight into real-world implications of research in the field of business administration.	Identifies practical applications relevant to professional practice; shows some understanding of real-world relevance in the field of business administration.	Discussed practical applications relevant to professional practice but need minor improvement to fully develop; shows some understanding of real-world relevance in the field of business administration.	Applications to practice are minimally addressed, with limited insight into professional impact in the field of business administration.	Lacks application to practice or relevance to professional context in the field of business administration..	
		Confidence in the selection and interpretation of reading including texts outside the module materials	Good selection and interpretation of reading including sources outside the module materials.				
Academic structure	10%	Logical, coherent and cohesive discussion or argument relevant to the requirements of the assignment	A thoughtful, well-structured discussion or argument relevant to the requirements of the assignment.	A sound range and interpretation of reading	An appropriate selection of reading.	A limited or none selection of reading	
		Evidence of reflection, independent thought and judgement in answering the question	A balanced, reflective and well-considered answer to the question.	A well developed, balanced description or discussion relevant to the requirements of the assignment.	Few irrelevancies in a description or discussion about the requirements of the assignment.	Irrelevancies in a description or discussion about the requirements of the assignment	
		Fluent and articulate writing	Clear, coherent and articulate writing	A well-structured, reflective answer to the question	An adequate answer to the question	A partial or fully irrelevant answer to the question	
		Faultless use of academic referencing	Consistent and correct academic referencing	Clear and coherent writing	Mainly clear and coherent writing	Some incoherent, unclear, unstructured writing	
				Minor inconsistencies in academic referencing	Minor inconsistencies academic referencing, but require substantial improvement.	Inconsistent and incorrect academic referencing	
	100%					Total Points:	/100

Annexure D: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 2: Research Proposal

Title of Assessment:

Student's Name :

Enrolment No :

Cohort:

		Good 70 to 84	Developing 60 to 69	Need Improvement 40 to 59	Not Acceptable below 40	Scored
Excellent 85 to 100						
Introduction and Research Problem	5%	Synthesises a unique, impactful research problem with clear significance to business practice; demonstrates originality and the potential to make a significant contribution to the field.	Defines a focused research problem that is relevant and well-articulated, with evident professional implications.	Identifies a relevant research problem, though scope or relevance may be limited.	Presents a basic research problem, lacking clarity or clear relevance to DBA practice.	Problem is unclear, lacks relevance, or is disconnected from business administration contexts.
Literature Review and Theoretical Framework	20%	Analyses and synthesises literature comprehensively to highlight a research gap, proposing a theoretical framework with innovation and depth.	Examines relevant literature, presenting a coherent theoretical framework that supports the proposed research.	Describes relevant literature adequately; theoretical framework is present but lacks depth or alignment.	Summarises limited literature, with an underdeveloped or unclear theoretical framework.	Literature coverage is minimal or lacks relevance; theoretical framework is missing or unrelated to the topic.
Research Questions and Objectives	20%	Formulates clear, researchable questions that align with DBA goals and demonstrate potential for advancing knowledge and application.	Defines researchable questions with clear alignment to research goals and DBA outcomes.	Presents research questions, though alignment to objectives may lack clarity or depth.	Identifies basic research questions, lacking alignment with objectives or DBA outcomes.	Research questions are vague, unclear, or misaligned with research objectives.
Methodology	20%	Designs a rigorous methodology, with innovative approaches to data collection and analysis that address complex research questions ethically and effectively.	Develops a well-structured methodology, showing ethical consideration and alignment with DBA research standards.	Implements an adequate methodology, though limited in depth or innovative approaches.	Uses basic methods with minimal ethical consideration or relevance to research goals.	Methodology is insufficient or lacks clear relevance and ethical alignment.
Application to Professional Practice	15%	Demonstrates the potential for significant, practical application in business, proposing actionable insights that bridge theory and practice.	Connects research objectives to practical implications, showing professional relevance.	Describes some potential practical applications but lacks depth in professional relevance.	Mentions limited application to practice, with unclear professional implications.	Application to practice is missing, vague, or irrelevant to business contexts.

Academic Structure and Organisation	10%	Demonstrates advanced organisation and clarity with logical flow, professional formatting, and strict adherence to citation standards.	Organises content clearly with logical flow; consistent formatting and citation adherence.	Structures content moderately well; minor inconsistencies in formatting or citations.	Presents a basic structure with notable inconsistencies in organisation, format, or citation.	Disorganised, with frequent errors in formatting and citation standards.	
Ethics and Professionalism	10%	Incorporates comprehensive ethical considerations with innovative solutions to potential challenges, demonstrating alignment with DBA standards.	Addresses relevant ethical considerations with clear alignment to DBA guidelines.	Acknowledges basic ethical issues but lacks depth or proactive solutions.	Mentions minimal ethical considerations with limited relevance to DBA standards.	Ethical considerations are missing or insufficient; fails to align with professional standards.	
Total	100%						

Annexure E: Level 8 Grading Criteria for DBA Milestone 3: Final Dissertation

Title of Assessment:

Student's Name :

Enrolment No :

Cohort:

Criteria	%	Need Improvement					Total
		Excellent (85-100)	Good (70-84)	Developing (60-69)	(40-59)	Not Acceptable (Below 40)	

Chapter 1: Introduction 5%	Synthesises the topic and context innovatively, presenting a clear, original, and impactful formal problem statement.	Defines the research focus effectively, providing a clear problem statement and objectives aligned with DBA standards.	Articulates a clear problem statement and research objectives, demonstrating relevance to the DBA field.	Provides a basic problem statement and objectives, but lacks clarity, depth, or originality required for doctoral students, though sufficient for Masters students at a pass grade.	Fails to present a clear problem statement or objectives. Minimal or irrelevant discussion of context, framework, or gaps.	
	Integrates the background of the organisation with well-founded practical relevance, a comprehensive conceptual framework, and robust methodological justification.	Presents relevant organisational context and conceptual framework with sound methodological justification.	Outlines the organisational context, conceptual framework, and methodology with evidence of a research gap and limitations but requires more depth and clarity.	Limited discussion of organisational context, conceptual framework, or research gaps.	No discussion of organisational context, conceptual framework, or research gaps.	
	Clearly identifies the research gap and demonstrates significant stakeholder value.	Shows good identification of research gaps and limitations.				
	Effectively highlights limitations.					

Chapter 2: Literature Review	20%	Conducts an advanced, synthesised review of scholarly and practitioner literature, incorporating an innovative literature search strategy.	Examines a diverse and relevant body of literature, demonstrating critical analysis and clear connection to research goals.	Reviews relevant literature, identifying key research gaps and demonstrating adequate critical evaluation.	Provides a limited literature review, with insufficient sources, minimal critical analysis, or unclear methodological relevance.	Minimal or insufficient literature review, lacking synthesis, critical analysis, or alignment with research objectives.	
		Exceed expectations in showing industry and organisational insights synthesised in a critical comprehensive manner.	Shows good industry and organisational insights with comprehensive synthesis.	Shows sound industry and organisational insights but can further develop comprehensive synthesis.	Shows just basic industry and organisational insights but can further develop comprehensive synthesis.	Do not show industry and organisational insights, or no synthesis provided.	
		Identifies theoretical models and gaps with clear justification for the selected methodologies.	Identifies theoretical models and gaps with good justification for selected methodologies.	Identifies theoretical models and gaps with sound justification for selected methodologies.	Identifies theoretical models and gaps with sound justification for selected methodologies.	Do not identify theoretical models and gaps with no justification for selected methodologies.	
Chapter 3: Methodology	20%	Designs a rigorous, innovative methodology, clearly justifying the selection of methods and their alignment with research objectives.	Applies appropriate research methods, effectively justifying their selection and alignment with objectives.	Provides a coherent methodological approach, outlining research methods and ethical considerations.	Outlines basic methods, but lacks clear justification or alignment with research objectives.		
		Elaborates and justifies step-by-step details of data collection and analysis processes. Demonstrates exemplary ethical	Outlines step-by-step details of data collection and analysis processes and its relevance.	Outlines step-by-step details of data collection and analysis processes and its relevance with scope of improvement.	Some evidence of step-by-step details of data collection and analysis processes but lacks comprehension.		
			Demonstrates good ethical assurances to mitigate risks	Demonstrates sound ethical assurances to	Ethical considerations are addressed superficially.	Insufficient or incoherent methodology, lacking alignment, justification, or ethical considerations.	

		assurances to mitigate risks to human subjects.	to human subjects.	mitigate risks to human subjects.			
Chapter 4: Data Collection and Analysis	20%	Executes meticulous data collection and advanced analysis, clearly aligned with research objectives and questions. Provides a creative and critical interpretation of findings, integrating them with the literature review. Demonstrates significant insight and application to DBA practice.	Conducts appropriate data collection and analysis, demonstrating solid alignment with objectives. Provides good and relevant interpretations and connects findings to research goals effectively.	Implements sound data collection and analysis, showing adequate relevance to objectives but depth or critical insight can be improved. Provides sound interpretations and connects findings to research goals in an acceptable manner.	Provides minimal data collection and analysis, with weak interpretation or limited alignment to objectives required for doctoral studies, but sufficient for master studies.		Fails to provide sufficient data collection or coherent analysis. Lacks relevance to objectives and research questions.
Chapter 5: Application to Practice and Discussion	20%	Synthesises findings into actionable and innovative recommendations, demonstrating significant impact on DBA practice. Provides a comprehensive application to Practice report with well-considered implications, reflective limitations, and clear recommendations for further research. The Executive Summary is precise and impactful.	Connects findings to practical recommendations, showing relevance and professional insight. Constructs a sound Application to Practice report and discusses limitations and future research adequately.	Draws relevant conclusions and offers practical recommendations, showing clear alignment with findings. Addresses limitations but with critical insight or innovative application that can be further improvised.	Summarises findings with limited coherence or relevance, offering basic recommendations and inadequate discussion of limitations or future research.		Fails to present coherent conclusions or practical applications. Lacks relevance, originality, or actionable recommendations.

Academic Structure and Organisation	10%	Demonstrates exemplary organisation and clarity, with logical flow, professional formatting, and strict adherence to citation standards. All chapters are well-integrated, demonstrating a seamless narrative.	Organises content clearly, with logical flow and consistent formatting. Adheres to citation standards with minor issues.	Provides a sound structure, with minor inconsistencies in organisation, formatting, or citations. Meets professional standards but could benefit from improved coherence.	Exhibits basic organisation, but the structure is disjointed, with frequent errors in formatting and citations.	Disorganised and incoherent structure, with significant formatting, citation, or logical flow issues.	
Ethics and Professionalism	5%	Incorporates exemplary ethical considerations, addressing complex ethical issues innovatively. Demonstrates strong alignment with DBA standards and ensures comprehensive mitigation of risks to human subjects.	Integrates ethical frameworks effectively, with clear reasoning and adherence to DBA standards. Addresses relevant ethical risks professionally.	Acknowledges and addresses ethical considerations adequately, though lacks comprehensive application or depth. Meets minimum ethical standards.	Acknowledges ethics superficially, with limited relevance or application to the study.	Fails to address ethical considerations, showing minimal or no alignment with DBA standards.	
Total	100 %						

Annexure F: Suggested Chapterisation and Sample Dissertation formats:

Disclaimer: Please note that the below suggested are only for reference purposes and may not be suitable for all kinds of submissions. Research candidates are motivated to read widely, review many other examples and employ the best format that best suits their research. For instance, the below format is based on quantitative study, and qualitative study or mixed methods may have varied heads.

The learners are required to write a dissertation of 60,000 words. Following are the suggested chapterisation, however Candidates are allowed to deviate from this suggested structure and follow what best suits their research.

Chapter I: Introduction

- Introduction to the Doctoral Study
- Formal problem statement – what?
- Background of the organisation (context) employs practical based research for DBA studies – why?
- Conceptual framework (foundation) – what?
- Methodological approach (justification) – how?
- Application to practice and stakeholder value (research gap)
- Limitations

Chapter II: Literature Review

- Literature search strategy
- Industry and organisational analysis/ theoretical models
- Synthesised comprehensive scholarly/practitioner literature review. The literature review should also examine the major concepts and sub-concepts relevant to the research topic.
- Review of the literature on the research method and design being utilised to provide an explanation of why this method and design is selected for the research.

Chapter III: Methodology

- Choose and explain appropriate research methods and design.
- Choose and explain appropriate data collection processes (interviews, surveys, focus groups, secondary data, etc.).
- Choose and explain the appropriate data analysis process(es). Each process should be detailed as a step-by-step procedure.
- Discuss ethical assurances to mitigate risk to human subjects.

Chapter IV: Data Collection and Data Analysis

- Focus on collection and analysis of real data from the Doctoral Study Project.
- Provide summary of results; relate results to the research question(s).
- Provide an evaluation of findings, its comparison to literature review.

Chapter V: Application to Practice and Discussion

- Construct the Application to Practice report for the Company/Organization that served as the focus of the study.
- Provide implications and recommendations for research or practical application.
- Following Chapter V, students will provide an Executive Summary Report.
- Offer a reflective assessment of limitations and suggestions for further research.



TITLE OF THESIS/ DISSERTATION

NAME OF CANDIDATE

**Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the degree of Name of
Programme**

European Global Institute of Innovation & Technology (EU Global)

2026

CERTIFICATION OF THESIS

I / We, the undersigned, certify that

NAME OF CANDIDATE

candidate for the degree of

NAME OF PROGRAMME

has presented his/her thesis/dissertation of the following title

TITLE OF THESIS/ DISSERTATION

as it appears on the title page and front cover of the thesis/dissertation that the research is acceptable in format and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the thesis/dissertation.

Name of Supervisor
Supervisor

Name of CoSR Chair

Name of Programme Leader

THESIS COPYRIGHT / AGREEMENT

AUTHOR : **NAME OF CANDIDATE**

TITLE : **TITLE OF THESIS/ DISSERTATION**

DEGREE : **NAME OF PROGRAMME**

Permission is herewith granted to the European Global Institute of Innovation & Technology (EU Global) to circulate and to have copied for non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of individuals or institutions.

Signature of Author

The author attests that permission has been obtained for the use of any copyrighted material appearing in the Dissertation (other than the brief excerpts requiring only proper acknowledgement in scholarly writing), and that all such use is clearly acknowledged.

DECLARATION

I, **Name of Candidate**, hereby declare that the *thesis/ dissertation/ research project based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at EU Global or other institution.

Name of Candidate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (sample)

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Professors/ Supervisors/ CoSR Chair, Programme Leader and staff from the European Global Institute of Innovation & Technology (EU Global) for their assistance during the completion process of my Ph.D.

Special thanks to my Supervisor, and Co-supervisor,. This would not have been possible without their supervision. It has been a great adventure completing this learning and research. Many thanks to my coursemates too.

My sincere appreciation to my parents, family and friends for the support and encouragement.

ABSTRACT (*sample*)

Antimicrobial resistance is one of the major threats to public health, causing serious issues in the prevention and treatment of diseases. Plant-derived extracts and essential oil (EO) have evolved as potential antimicrobials to treat human diseases. This study aimed to investigate the chemical composition, antioxidant, antimicrobial and antibiofilm activities of *Backhousia citriodora* methanolic (BCME) and aqueous (BCAE) extracts and its BCEO. Identification and quantification of phytochemical compounds of the samples were revealed via qualitative phytochemical, GC-MS, GC-FID, total phenolic (TPC), flavonoids (TFC), flavonols and flavones (TFFC) contents. Antioxidative properties of BC extracts and BCEO were evaluated using DPPH and FRAP assays. The antibacterial activities were assessed by agar disc diffusion and broth microdilution methods. The antibiofilm activity were investigated using the crystal violet method. Phytochemical analyses revealed the presence of carbohydrates, saponins, tannins, flavonoids, terpenoids, glycosides and steroids in BC extracts. Twenty-one compounds were identified in the BCEO using GC-MS analyses. The main components of BCEO were geranial and neral. TPC and TFC were found significantly ($P<0.05$) higher in BC extracts. Similarly, BCME and BCEO had significantly ($P<0.05$) lower IC₅₀ in DPPH (34.68 μ g/mL) and EC₅₀ in FRAP (20.03 μ g/mL), respectively, showing the potential of antioxidant activity. BCEO exhibited significantly ($P<0.05$) stronger antibacterial activity against the four tested microorganisms than BC extracts. The BCEO showed significantly ($P<0.05$) higher biofilm inhibition and eradication percentages against all tested microorganisms than BC extracts. The study demonstrated that *B. citriodora* especially its EO, could potentially have a role in treating infectious diseases.

Keywords: *Backhousia citriodora*, Extracts and essential Oil, Phytochemicals, Antioxidant, Antibacterial, Antibiofilm

TABLE OF CONTENTS (*sample*)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Microinsurance and Insurance	2
1.3 The Takaful component of Islamic financing	5
1.4 Takaful	9
1.5 Differences between Takaful and insurance	11
1.6 Problem statements	14
1.7 Research objective	17
1.8 Research question	17
1.9 Significant of the research	17
1.9.1 Takaful companies	18
1.9.2 Decision-maker	18
1.9.3 Customers	18
1.9.4 Researchers of the Future	19

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	21
2.1 Introduction	21
2.2 Variable	21
2.2.1 Dependent Variable	21
2.2.1.1 Intention to opt for Takaful insurance	21
2.2.2 Independent Variables	24
2.2.2.1 Attitude	24
2.2.2.2 Subjective Norms	26
2.2.2.3 Perceived Behavioural Control	28
2.2.2.4 Agent characteristics	29
2.2.2.5 Religiosity	32
2.2.2.6 Awareness toward Takaful product	33
2.3 Review of Relevant Theoretical Methods	34
2.3.1 Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)	35
2.3.2 Theory of planned behaviour	36
2.3.3 Social Exchange Theory	37
2.4 Conceptual Framework	38
2.5 Hypothesis Development	39
2.5.1 Attitude	39
2.5.2 Subjective Norms	40
2.5.3 Perceived Behavioural Control	40
2.5.4 Characteristic of agent	40
2.5.5 Religiosity	41
2.5.6 Awareness	41
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	43
3.1 Introduction	43
3.2 Research Design	43
3.3 Data Collection Methods	44

3.3.1 Primary Data	44
3.4 Sampling Design	44
3.4.1 Target Population	44
3.4.2 Sampling Frame and Sampling Location	45
3.4.3 Sampling Elements	45
3.4.4 Sampling Technique	45
3.4.5 Sampling Size	46
3.5 Research Instrument	47
3.5.1 Research Design	47
3.5.2 Descriptive analysis (Pilot)	48
3.5.3 Reliability Test (Pilot)	49
3.6 Constructs Measurement (Scale and Operational Definitions)	49
3.6.1 Scale of Measurement	50
3.6.1.1 Nominal Scale	50
3.6.1.2 Five Points Likert Scale	50
3.6.2 Questionnaire design	50
3.7 Data Processing	52
3.7.1 Data Collecting	53
3.7.2 Data Validation	53
3.7.3 Data Editing	53
3.7.4 Data Cleaning	54
3.7.5 Data Analysing	54
3.8 Data Analysis	54
3.8.1 Descriptive Analysis	54
3.8.2 Scale Measurement	55
3.8.2.1 Reliability Test	55
3.8.2.2 Normality Test	56
3.8.3 Inferential Analysis	57
3.8.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis	57
3.8.3.2 Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) Analysis	58

CHAPTER IV RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS	60
4.1 Introduction	60
4.2 Response Rate	60
4.3 Data Coding	61
4.4 Data screening	61
4.4.1 Missing data	62
4.4.2 Detecting Outlier	62
4.5 Multicollinearity test	62
4.6 Descriptive Analysis	63
4.6.1 Respondent Demographic Profile	63
4.6.1.1 Location	64
4.6.1.2 Gender	64
4.6.1.3 Age	65
4.6.1.4 Religion	65
4.7 Test of parametric Assumption	66
4.7.1 Normality Test	66
4.7.2 Reliability Test	67
4.8 Result discussion	68
4.8.1 Pearson Correlation Analysis	68
4.8.1.1 Hypothesis testing	70
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS & APPLICATION TO PRACTICE	75
5.1 Introduction	75
5.2 Discussion of Major Findings	75
5.2.1 Attitude	75
5.2.2 Subjective norms	76
5.2.3 Perceived behavioural control	77
5.2.4 Attributes of agents	77
5.2.5 Religiosity	78
5.2.6 Awareness	78

5.3 Implications of the Study	79
5.3.1 Managerial Implications	79
5.4 Limitation of the Study	81
5.5 Recommendations for Future Research	83
 REFERENCES	 87
 APPENDICES	 99

LIST OF FIGURES (*sample*)

Figure No.	Title of Figure	Page No
Figure 2.1: Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)		36
Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework		38
Figure 4.1 Percentage of Respondents based on Location		64
Figure 4.2 Percentage of Respondents based on Gender		64
Figure 4.3 Percentage of Respondents based on Age		65
Figure 4.4 Percentage of Respondents based on Religion		65

LIST OF TABLES (*sample*)

Table No.	Title of Table	Page N
Table 1.1: distinctions between Takaful and insurance		13
Table 3.1: Descriptive analysis for the demographic profile		48
Table 3.2: Rules of Thumb about Cronbach's Alpha coefficient size		55
Table 3.3: Rule of Thumb about Pearson Correlation Coefficient		57
Table 4.1 Distribution and Retention of Questionnaires		60
Table 4.2; Data Coding		61
Table 4.3 Procedure for missing data		62
Table 4.4 Multicollinearity test		63
Table 4.5: Normality result		67
Table 4.6: Reliability Test for Substantive Study		67
Table 4.7; Pearson Correlation Analysis		68

Table 4.8; Findings 70

Table 4.9 : Hypothesis Summary Table 73

EU Global

End of the Document

EU Global