

FINAL EXAMINATION (EAS)

Entrepreneur & Management Research — Comprehensive Research Evaluation

Coverage: Meetings 1–15 | Format: Structured analytical case-based essay | Total: 100 points

A. Purpose of the Examination

This examination is not designed to assess memorization alone. Students must demonstrate comprehensive scientific reasoning by evaluating a research situation from problem formulation to defensible conclusions.

- Transform a managerial situation into a researchable academic problem (disciplined problem formulation).
- Show alignment among problem, paradigm, framework, design, sampling, instrument quality, analysis, and claims.
- Interpret evidence responsibly and avoid overclaiming; state limitations clearly.
- Demonstrate ethical awareness in cultural/community contexts and responsible representation.
- Communicate findings clearly in academic writing and defend choices under questioning.

B. General Instructions

- Read the case carefully before answering the questions.
- Use clear academic English. Avoid purely personal opinions not supported by research logic.
- Relate each answer explicitly to concepts covered in Meetings 1–15.
- You may use tables, simple diagrams, and structured arguments when they clarify your answer.
- There is no single perfect answer, but every choice must be logically and methodologically justified.
- State your assumptions if case information is insufficient.

Exam Policy

Limited open-note examination

Students may use their own lecture notes, but may not copy from classmates, use ready-made answers from the internet, or use generative AI during the examination unless explicitly permitted by the lecturer.

Student Identity:

Field	Fill in
Name	
Student ID Number	
Class	
Signature	

C. Final Case Study

Threads of Sumba 2.0: Growth, Trust, and Ethical Cultural Marketing

Loka Tenun Prai Madeta is a community-based social enterprise in East Sumba that works with 42 women weavers. After a successful digital push in 2025, awareness and sales increased, but conversion quality and repeat purchase remain low. Public discussions also raise concerns about cultural commodification and transparency in benefit-sharing.

In early 2026, the management team tests two content strategies:

- Strategy A (Cultural Storytelling Focus): emphasizes motif meaning, tradition, and cultural identity.
- Strategy B (Process & Transparency Focus): emphasizes production process, pricing logic, and value-sharing transparency.

The team asks: 'Which strategy is better, and how can we prove it scientifically?' Students must propose an academically defensible evaluation study and show ethical sensitivity.

Preliminary Case Indicators (for reasoning)

Indicator	Illustrative pattern	Emerging analytical question
Reach vs. quality	A: higher reach; B: lower reach but more saves/shares	Is reach sufficient to explain conversion?
Trust & authenticity	Questions about authenticity and pricing persist	How does perceived authenticity shape trust and intention?
Repeat purchase	Repeat purchase remains low overall	Is the issue awareness, trust, or retention?
Ethical tension	Some weavers worry about exoticization	How to protect cultural sensitivity and fair representation?

D. Examination Questions (Answer all) — Total 100 points

1) Comprehensive Problem Diagnosis (10 points)

- a. Identify three research-relevant symptoms and two managerial concerns in the case.
- b. Distinguish between managerial problem, practical business problem, and academic research problem.
- c. Write one strong final research problem statement (1–2 sentences) more scientific than ‘Which strategy is better?’

2) Research Questions & Objectives (10 points)

- a. Write one coherent academic problem statement paragraph (6–10 sentences).
- b. Formulate three aligned and researchable research questions.
- c. Formulate two research objectives aligned with your RQs.
- d. Explain briefly why the RQs are not too broad, not normative, and answerable with data.

3) Research Paradigm & Evidence Logic (10 points)

- a. Choose the most suitable paradigm: positivist, interpretivist, or pragmatic.
- b. Justify your choice based on problem nature, evidence type, and evaluation purpose.
- c. Explain what counts as evidence within your paradigm (be specific about data).
- d. Explain one methodological risk if a mismatched paradigm is chosen.

4) Literature Review as Strategic Mapping + Gap (15 points)

- a. Provide at least 6 relevant literature keywords.
- b. Create a simple literature map (a text diagram is fine) connecting at least 5 concepts.
- c. Identify one research gap and explain why it matters academically and managerially.
- d. Define four core constructs/concepts operationally (brief but measurable/observable).

5) Conceptual Framework + Hypotheses/Propositions (15 points)

- a. Build one conceptual framework (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods).
- b. Explain the direction/logic of relationships among the constructs.
- c. Provide at least two hypotheses (quant) OR two propositions (qual/mixed).
- d. Explain why your framework is stronger than simply comparing ‘A vs B strategy’.

6) Research Design, Sampling, and Ethics (15 points)

- a. Choose a design (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods) and justify it.
- b. Choose data collection techniques and justify them.

- c. Specify population, unit of analysis, sampling frame, sampling technique, and inclusion criteria.
- d. Explain two key ethics considerations (cultural representation, community protection, consent, benefit-sharing).

7) Data Analysis Plan (Quantitative + Qualitative Readiness) (15 points)

- Answer according to your chosen design:
 - If quantitative (or mixed): variables & measurement; validity/reliability checks; analysis techniques; result patterns supporting/rejecting hypotheses.
 - If qualitative (or mixed): data sources; coding/thematic plan; credibility strategies; what patterns count as convincing evidence.

8) Interpretation, Reporting, and Defense Readiness (10 points)

- a. Explain two examples of overclaiming that could happen in this case—and rewrite them into responsible claims.
- b. Write a short results-to-implication paragraph (6–8 sentences) including one limitation.
- c. Provide three tough Q&A questions a reviewer might ask in a Final Showcase, and outline strong answers (1–2 sentences each).

E. Suggested Answer Format

- Use headings corresponding to Q1–Q8.
- Use tables to distinguish symptoms, problems, and academic research problems.
- Use a simple diagram for the framework (e.g., A → B → C; or Themes → Mechanism → Outcome).
- Write concisely but analytically. Avoid one-sentence answers without justification.
- Suggested length: 1,800–3,000 words if typed (or equivalent handwritten).

F. General Assessment Criteria (Rubric)

Assessment aspect	Weight	Criteria for a strong answer
Conceptual accuracy	20%	Uses research concepts appropriately (problem, RQ, paradigm, literature map, framework, design, sampling, validity/credibility, interpretation).
Depth of analysis	20%	Connects concepts to case evidence; shows reasoning, not just definitions.
Methodological consistency	25%	Strong alignment among problem–paradigm–

		framework–design– sampling–analysis–claims.
Interpretation & responsible claiming	15%	Avoids overclaiming; writes defensible conclusions & limitations.
Academic clarity & reporting	10%	Clear structure, coherent paragraphs, proper academic language.
Ethics & originality	10%	Ethical sensitivity (culture/community), independent thinking, transparent assumptions.

Good luck. Show that good research ends with disciplined, critical, ethical, and defensible reasoning.