Academy of Music and Performance

BA (Hons) Music & Creative Music Technology

Module MCM602

Dissertation

Module booklet

2016 – 2017

Deadline for submission: see below

Tutor: Nick Redfern

Telephone: 0115 – 838 0132

e-mail: nick.redfern@ncn.ac.uk

Room: 125 Time: Thursday 10.00 to 11.00

Start date: WB 3rd October 2016   Proposal end date: 15.00 Friday 25th November 2016

Dissertation end date: 15.00 Friday 21st April 2017

Hard copy dissertation deadline: June 2017

What will you do to complete this module?

Proposal

You will write a proposal for your dissertation of a subject agreed by you and your tutor. The suggested word count is 1,000 words. The proposal will include:

Title page

Introduction

Rationale

Methodology

Literary review

References

Dissertation

You will write an academic dissertation of a subject of your choice but negotiated with your tutor. The suggested word count is 8,000.

The cover

- the title of the dissertation

- your name and college ID number

- your course title

- your tutor

- the date of submission

The dissertation format

- Text font Arial or Verdana; double spacing and justified text font size 11 0r 12

- Single side print

- Leave a wide left margin for binding

- All diagrams, tables and graphs should be numbered (Figure 1, Figure 2, etc) and fully titled with a table of figures (Word will do this for you)

- Page numbers should appear at the bottom right hand side of each page

- Provide a page-numbered contents page and, where appropriate, an appendix list. Word will generate a Table of Contents for you.

- All sources should be fully referenced and cited using the Harvard system

- Provide a separate discography for any songs or albums mentioned

- Use a single clear line space rather than an indentation for paragraphs

- Text, headings and sub-headings should be left justified

- Include an abstract (approx. 100 words) before the main body of your work which provides an overview of the dissertation as a whole.

How will the subject be taught?

Lectures and individual tutorials.

How will the proposal & dissertation be submitted?

Proposal: Word file email christopher.hickling@ncn.ac.uk

Dissertation: Word file email christopher.hickling@ncn.ac.uk

One hard copy for the LRC to be handed to Nick Redfern in June 2017.

How will the dissertation be assessed?

It will be assessed in accordance with the Module Learning Outcomes.

What is the assessment strategy?

The assessment strategy will reflect the aims and learning outcomes of the relevant module and will include

- Evidence of Research Skills

- Width and depth of research

- Presentation of research

- Construction of argument

- Strength of conclusions

What are the deadlines for this module?

Proposal end date: 15.00 Friday 25th November 2016

Dissertation end date: 15.00 Friday 21st April 2017

Hard copy dissertation deadline: June 2017

What are the penalties for late submission?

A late submission will result in a maximum grade of 40%. A submission after 5 working days of the deadline will result in failure.

What is the process for a deadline extension?

Complete the extension form and email to nick.redfern@ncn.ac.uk 5 working days before the deadline.

You will have to present evidence of a substantial body of work and you may need a doctor's note.

MODULE MANAGEMENT

Credit points and Duration:	20 credit points – 30 weeks
Module Leader:	Nick Redfern
Subject:	Music
School:	Academy of Music and Performance
Pre- or post-requisites:	None
Site of Delivery:	**ncn** – Clarendon Campus
Date:	August 2016

External examiner

Dr Paul Oliver Lecturer in Music & Music Business Perth College, University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI)

Internal verification

Signature:

Date:

Module Specification 2016 to 2017

		Basic Module Information
1	**Module Title**	Dissertation
2	**Module Code**	MCM602
3	**Credit Points**	20 Credit points
4	**Duration**	30 weeks
5	**School**	Creative, Cultural & Digital Cluster
6	**Date**	22/08/2016

7	**Pre, Post and Co-requisites**
	These are modules that you must have studied previously in order to take this module, or modules that you must study simultaneously or in a subsequent academic session
	Pre, Co, Post Module Code Module Title
	None
8	**Programmes containing the module**
	Level Core/Option Mode Code Programme Title
	6 Core FT/PT MCM602 BA (Hons) Music & Creative Music Technology

9	**Overview and Aims**
	The aim of this module is to provide a unique opportunity for students to become independent learners and develop their own particular interests. It offers the chance to build on past experiences, enhance existing skills of planning and organisation and develop new skills of a practical and methodological nature. This independent study module is a key element of the programme and allows you to work at your own pace.
10	**Module content**
	The Module examines:
	• Research methods, including managing the dissertation, sources of information, reviewing literature, qualitative, quantitative and primary research, presentation, writing the dissertation. • Development and completion of the project proposal in consultation with the dissertation tutor. • The structure and content of the dissertation will be dependent on the topic under investigation and will be negotiated in conjunction with the dissertation tutor.
11	**Indicative reading**
	Cottrell, Stella. 2003. *The Study Skills Handbook* (2nd Edition), London: Palgrave
	Swetnam, Derek. 2004. *Writing your Dissertation, (3rd Edition)*, Oxford: HowTo Books

Walliman, Nicholas. 2004. *Your Undergraduate Dissertation: The Essential Guide for Success*, London: Sage

12	**Learning outcomes**
	Back to <u>How will the dissertation be assessed?</u>
	Learning outcomes describe what you should know and be able to do by the end of the module
	Knowledge and understanding. After studying this module you should be able to:
	1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant theory and provide a synthesis
	2. Critically analyse empirical findings in the context of the theoretical review
	Skills, qualities and attributes. After studying this module you should be able to:
	1. Identify a research topic within the Music & Creative Music Technology and clearly define the desired outcomes
	2. Plan, implement and evaluate appropriate data gathering techniques
	3. Present conclusions consistent with the preceding analysis
	4. Implement skills in report writing and preparation
13	**Teaching and learning**
	Range of modes of contact

This indicates the range of direct contact teaching and learning methods used on this module, eg, lectures, seminars

Tutorial   30

Total contact hours   30

Range of other learning methods

This indicates the range of other teaching and learning methods used on this module, eg, directed reading, research

Self-directed learning – Directed reading, 170
preparing assignment, individual research,
internet searching, literature search, original
empirical research

**Total   non-contact 170
hours**

14 Assessment methods

This indicates the type and weighting of assessment elements in the module

Weighting	Type	Description
10%	Proposal	A proposal of 1000 words detailing the aims, objectives, methodology and planned timescale of their dissertation.
90%	Dissertation	A dissertation of around 8,000 words to fulfil the outline of the proposal.

Diagnostic/formative assessment

This indicates if there are any assessments that do not contribute directly to the final module mark:

Throughout the module you will have the opportunity to discuss your progress with your tutor and receive informal feedback

Further information on assessment

This section provides further information on the module's assessment where appropriate

Proposal – Detailed summative written feedback

Dissertation – Detailed summative written feedback

No 2: Generic Assessment Criteria: Project Proposal

SMAC = Specific Module Assessment Criteria

You will find below the kinds of areas that your tutors will be considering when assessing your written work. Remember, though, that your tutors will be looking at your piece of work as a whole when determining the final mark. They will be happy to discuss their assessment with you and show you how to maximise your strengths and firm up on your weaker points.

	Idea/Concept Development		Theory & Principles		Analysis Evaluation		Methodology		Communication, Written English Referencing/Research	
Weighting	30%		20%		20%		15%		15%	
86 – 100% Upper First	26 +	An exceptional idea. Can identify new perspectives in and modifications to existing knowledge structures, new areas for investigation, new problems for solution, transfer of knowledge/solutions into new concepts.	17+	An exceptional ability to combine knowledge and principles in novel ways. The student is objective. Theories are sensitively and critically applied. There is an analysis and solution of	17 +	An exceptional ability to analyse complex situations and problems from a range of different viewpoints / theoretical standpoints and all with objectivity.	13 +	An exceptional body of evidence is presented with due reflection to potential limitations. Sophisticated skill has been used to overcome these limitations. Justifiable methods have been used with consideration to the limitations on time and resources. A high level of	13 +	Extensive range of English used. Evidence of thorough research plus as below.

				complex substantial problems.				understanding of research paradigms.		
70 – 85% First	21-25	A convincing exposition of the subject proposed with a deep understanding of the complexities of the subject. An excellent idea with and in depth concept developed.	14-16	A convincing ability of knowledge and understanding of key theories and principles but with a clearer understanding of their interrelationships and discrimination of their relevance in different contexts.	14-16	Understanding of the complexities of the subject and clear suggestions of the analysis patterns. The reader is convinced by the power of the analysis presented. It is laid out in a well-structured and coherent fashion. Sections relate well to each other and build up to form a convincing whole. The student is able to present a clear critique of the work of others.	10.5-12	Excellent choice of appropriate and most effective research methods clearly defined and justified. Awareness of limitations of methods chosen and arguments for it. The use of deductive or inductive approaches have either been acknowledged or employed. An emphasis of a link between theory and research has been made.	10.5-12	In a professional style and of very good grammatical quality. Excellent use of technical language where appropriate.

Extensively and accurately referenced using citations and quotes throughout, supported by a detailed list of references and bibliography identifying all sources. |

| 60-69% 2.1 | 18-20 | A sound understanding of the subject is demonstrated, with the subject being set in the context of an appropriate range of material. | 12-13 | A clear and convincing identification of existing theories and principles and consideration of potential limitations. | 12-13 | A clear analysis is presented which engages the reader and prompts a debate. Positions are not merely listed but are weighed carefully. The argument flows, with good cross-referencing between parts of the project proposal. | 9 | Choice of sound methodology making appropriate use of a framework. The use of qualitative or/and quantitative methods or acknowledged. Full awareness of reasons of use. | 9 | In an easily read style with very few grammatical errors. Good use of technical language where appropriate. Accurate referencing using citations and quotes throughout with detailed List of references and bibliography |
| 50-59% 2.2 | 15-17 | A reasonable understanding of the subject area and the concept, with evidence of knowledge of the major works in the area | 10-11 | The available theories are critically applied, with justified choices being made. | 10-11 | There is clear sense of a position being developed, with the argument and analysis being developed through the project proposal. There might, however, be | 7.5-8 | Shown understanding of either a method which tests a theory or generates a theory. Not too sure why the methods have been chosen. | 7.5-8 | In a comprehensible style with some grammatical errors. Use of technical language sometimes marred Providing insufficient citations to work and limited use of a list of references and |

						points at which it could be expressed more clearly.				bibliography.
40-49% 3rd	12-14	A superficial understanding of the subject area, with some evidence of the literature available. Very little effort placed on the idea.	8-9	The importance of relevant theories seem to be understood	8-9	There is a basic ability to analyse simple situations, however it is more descriptive	6+	A superficial understanding of methodology using only words such as questionnaires, with little evidence as to why.	6+	Readable but of a poor standard in terms of structure and may disregard instructions about the format required. May contain many grammatical errors. Often drawn mainly from other sources such as lecture material or reference books. Often lacking references to sources used.
26 – 39% Marginal Fail	8-11	Little evidence of an understanding of the subject. Some of the key areas probably considered but usually no original contribution.	5-7	Finds it hard to articulate the conceptual dimension of the theories and principals. May demonstrate	5-7	The analysis is implied rather than being explicit. The themes presented are confused and	4+	Little evidence is produced, or that which is produced lacks relevance. There are too many unsupported assertions. The	4+	Problems with grammar that hinder meaning. Little evidence of proof reading. Often lacking suitable acknowledgement of

				superficial or lack of understanding of significant areas.		lack flow and coherence.		methods used are either unclear or inappropriate, and there is very little justification.		the source of the material presented. List of references and bibliography pages not separated. NCN Harvard system not used. Not within the word count.
0 – 25% Clear Fail	0-7	No evidence of a new area for investigation. Regurgitated concept.	0-4	No concept of theories and principles in conjunction with their chosen subject. . Often largely drawn directly from lecture notes and standard reference books	0-4	The work is purely descriptive and no analysis is given.	0-3	No understanding of how the research methods will aid the project. No justification of this section. Lacks organisation and omits some areas of fundamental importance.	0-3	Very poor written English, hindering the meaning. Contains many grammatical errors. List of references and bibliography pages not separated.

Generic Assessment Criteria: Dissertation

You will find below the kinds of areas that your tutors will be considering when assessing your written work. Remember, though, that your tutors will be looking at your piece of work as a whole when determining the final mark. They will be happy to discuss their assessment with you and show you how to maximise your strengths and firm up on your weaker points.

	Theories and concepts		Evidence		Argument		Conclusions and reflection		Referencing		Written English	
Weighting	30 %		20%		20%		10%		10%		10%	
86 – 100% Upper First	26 +	An exceptional exposition of the subject & displays a deep understanding of the complexities of the subject. The student is objective. Theories are sensitively and critically applied. Own theory developed.	17+	An exceptional body of evidence is presented with due reflection to potential limitations. Sophisticated skill has been used to overcome these limitations. Justifiable methods have been used with consideration to the limitations on time and resources. A high level of understanding of research paradigms	17 +	A powerful argument, which is much focused. The transition from findings to analysis is clear. Excellent critical and analytical abilities shown. Very high standard of English.	9+	The conclusion reflects the impact of theoretical material on the findings. No new evidence is presented. Contains evidence of sound independent thinking. All objectives have been met.	9+	Complete and correct. Extensive number of journals used.	9+	An exceptional command of English. An extensive use of academic vocabulary and expression. The dissertation is direct, clear and elegant.

70 – 85% First	21-25	A convincing exposition of the subject & displays a deep understanding of the complexities of the subject. The student is able to stand back from the subject and place it in a wider context. Theories are sensitively and critically applied.	14-16	A convincing body of evidence is presented with due consideration to potential limitations. Strenuous efforts have been made to overcome these limitations and to employ the most appropriate methods available given limitations on time and resources.	14-16	The reader is convinced by the power of the argument presented. It is laid out in a well-structured and coherent fashion. Sections relate well to each other and build up to form a convincing whole. The student is able to present a clear critique of the work of others.	8	The convincing nature of the conclusion demonstrates the overall grasp of both the content and the process that the student has. The dissertation itself could represent a contribution to the area and indicates potential for work at a higher level.	8	Complete and correct. Large number of journals used.	8	Clear command of the written word, with a style that encourages engagement. Wide vocabulary and stimulating range of expression
60 – 69% 2.1	18-20	A sound understanding of the subject is demonstrated, with the subject being set in the context of an appropriate range of material. The available theories	12-13	The evidence gathered is carefully linked to the problem and the theories employed. The methods used are well suited to the needs of the topic and there is sound reflection on potential	12-13	A clear argument is presented which engages the reader and prompts a debate. Positions are not merely listed but are weighed carefully. The	6	The conclusions draw upon the evidence and argument presented to form a sound end to the dissertation. This clearly indicates what might be	6	Complete and correct. Sound use of journals.	6	Interesting style, which is easy to follow and understand. Use of language is appropriate.

		are critically applied, with justified choices being made.		limitations.		argument flows, with good cross-referencing between parts of the dissertation.		done to take the research forward. It also demonstrates an ability to critically reflect on the process.				
50 – 59% 2.2	15 - 17	A reasonable understanding of the subject area, with evidence of knowledge of the major works in the area. The importance of relevant theories is understood.	10 - 11	A reasonable range of evidence is presented, gathered using appropriate methods. These methods are explained in a satisfactory manner and some thought has been paid to problems of interpretation.	10-11	There is clear sense of a position being developed, with the argument being developed through the dissertation. There might, however, be points at which it could be expressed more clearly.	5	The conclusions build upon the evidence presented to give a reasonable summation to the dissertation. There is some evidence of recognition of problems in the process and an ability to point the way forward.	5	Substantially complete and correct	5	Clear and easy to follow, but further work would improve flow. Minor proof reading errors
40 – 49% 3rd	12 - 14	A superficial understanding of the subject area, with some evidence of the	8 - 9	There is a tendency towards too much information and not enough discussion. There is insufficient	8-9	The argument is implied rather than being explicit. The themes	4	Some conclusions are presented, but they lack conviction and	4	Unsatisfactory in scope or technique	4	Generally understandable, but could use work to improve

		literature available. However, unable to articulate the conceptual dimension of the research.		reflection on the methods employed.		presented are confused and lack flow and coherence.		fail to draw upon the important facets of the evidence of an ability to reflect on the process undertaken and to recognise strengths and weaknesses.				understanding. Rather careless with proof reading
26 – 39% Marginal Fail	8 - 11	Little evidence of an understanding of the basic parameters of the subject. Difficult to relate the questions either to the topic selected or the available literature.	5 - 7	Little evidence is produced, or that which is produced lacks relevance. There are too many unsupported assertions. The methods used are either unclear or inappropriate, and there is little justification.	5-7	There is little sense of a sustained argument. The work is fragmented and lacks clear themes.	3	The conclusions bear little relation to the main body of the work. They fail to deliver a conclusion supported by the evidence, but merely assert.	3	Major weaknesses; material not referenced. Reference and bibliography pages not separated. NCN Harvard system not used.	3	Problems with grammar that hinder meaning. Little evidence of proof reading.
0 – 25% Clear Fail	0 - 7	Little or no evidence of having read the relevant literature. Little or no evidence of	0 - 4	Little or no understanding of the how research methods will aid the project. No	0-4	No sense of an argument. Little or no findings. No evidence of critical and	0 - 2	A very short conclusion with no relation to aims and objectives. No	0 - 2	Problems with grammar that hinder meaning. Little	0 - 2	Often inarticulate. No evidence of proof reading. Substantial

		aims and objectives addressing the information or vice versa.		justification of this section.		analytical abilities.		reflection and no understanding of the wider implications.		evidence of proof reading.		faults in logic and structure.