

Feedback for M. Müller

Thesis Health Check Report

Reviewed by your assigned proofreader

3 September 2026

Note: This is an illustrative sample report, provided so you can see the depth and style of feedback before you order. Your own report will assess your thesis specifically across the same six categories.

CATEGORY	FEEDBACK	ASSESSMENT
Structure & thread	Chapter 3, "History of Digitalisation in Switzerland" (pp. 24–37), currently reads somewhat like a stand-alone section rather than an integral part of the thesis. While the chapter provides useful background information, its connection to the research question and to the analysis that follows is not always clear. The transition from Chapter 3 to Chapter 4 is particularly abrupt. The historical overview introduces several concepts that are not subsequently used in the analysis, which makes the overall narrative feel longer than necessary. Recommendation: Consider shortening the historical overview and retaining only the material that directly supports your research question and later analysis. Alternatively, make the purpose of the chapter clearer at the beginning and explicitly connect its key findings to Chapter 4. A stronger transition could also help the reader understand why this background is necessary for answering your research question.	Needs fixes
Research question & focus	The research question on p. 8 currently combines several different dimensions: employee motivation, job satisfaction, productivity, and team culture. These are all relevant topics, but together they create a relatively broad research focus. The main research question is also not fully reflected in the conclusion. In particular, the aspect of team culture introduced as Sub-question 3 on p. 9 is not explicitly answered in Section 6.1. This creates a slight mismatch between what your thesis promises to investigate and what it ultimately answers. Recommendation: Review whether all four dimensions are essential to your research question. If team culture remains part of the research focus, make sure the analysis and conclusion address it explicitly. If it is not central to your argument, consider narrowing the research question. A more focused research question could be: "How does remote work affect employee motivation in Zurich-based SMEs?" The aim is not necessarily to rewrite the research question completely, but to ensure that the scope of the thesis is manageable and that every element introduced in the research question is answered by the end of the thesis.	Needs fixes

Argumentation & Depth	The central line of argument (remote work → autonomy → motivation) is generally clear and easy to follow. The analysis makes a convincing connection between the interview findings and the role of autonomy. However, some statements are stronger than the evidence currently allows. For example, the statement on p. 58 that “The results clearly show that autonomy increases motivation” presents the finding as more conclusive than can reasonably be established from 12 interviews. Two participants also described feelings of isolation (p. 55). These perspectives should be acknowledged more explicitly because they provide an important counterpoint to the broader argument. Recommendation: Use more cautious academic wording where appropriate, such as “suggest,” “indicate,” or “the findings point towards”, and briefly discuss the contrasting participant responses. This would strengthen the academic credibility of the argument rather than weaken it. A strong thesis does not need every finding to support the same conclusion; it needs to demonstrate that different findings have been considered and interpreted appropriately.	Strong
Sources & Evidence	The literature base provides a useful foundation, but several areas would benefit from closer attention. For example, the statement on p. 15 that “Studies consistently show that remote workers are more productive” is currently not supported by a citation. Because this is a broad empirical claim, the reader should be able to identify the evidence behind it. There is also a noticeable reliance on Müller (2019) in Chapter 2, where the source is cited eight times. Try to diversify your literature on the topic. Recommendation: Review unsupported factual and empirical claims and add appropriate sources where necessary. Consider whether more recent and varied literature could strengthen the theoretical background. The goal is not simply to increase the number of references. The more important question is whether the key claims in your argument are supported by appropriate and sufficiently current evidence.	Needs fixes
Language & Style	The overall language is understandable and appropriately academic, but several sentences could be made more direct and concise. For example: “The implementation of the introduction of remote work policies led to a reduction of the motivation of employees.” This could be simplified to: “Introducing remote work policies reduced employee motivation.” There are also repeated formulations that make some sections feel heavier than necessary. For example, the phrase “in the context of” appears 14 times in Chapter 2. These are not necessarily individual errors, but together they affect the readability and flow of the thesis. Recommendation: Look for unnecessarily complex constructions, repeated phrases and nominalisations. Aim for sentences that communicate the same academic meaning more directly. At this stage, the focus should be on clarity, readability and academic tone, rather than correcting every individual grammatical or punctuation issue.	Needs fixes

Citation & Formatting	The citation style is generally recognisable, but there are inconsistencies that should be resolved before submission. The citations both in-text and the reference list should follow APA 7 style consistently. There is also a reference to Weber (2020) on p. 19 that does not currently appear in the bibliography. The formatting of citations, references, tables, and figures should ultimately be checked against the APA 7 citation style as required by your university. Recommendation: Before submission, check that: every in-text citation appears in the reference list; every reference-list entry is cited in the thesis where required; the same citation conventions are applied consistently; tables and figures follow the required formatting guidelines; headings, numbering and spacing remain consistent throughout.	Critical
----------------------------------	---	-----------------

Overall Assessment

Your thesis addresses a relevant question and demonstrates a clear effort to connect the theoretical literature with your own empirical findings. The central argument around remote work, autonomy, and motivation is visible throughout the analysis, and the interview data provides a useful basis for your discussion. The main opportunity now is to make the thesis more focused and more consistent: ensure that the research question, structure, evidence and conclusion all point in the same direction. You have already built a strong foundation.

Assessed by



Dr. Meriton Ceka

Founder & CEO, Delta Lektorat

[Book a meeting here.](#)

Delta Lektorat | Flawilerstrasse 31 | 9500 Wil SG | Schweiz

Tel. +41 71 224 71 64 | Mob. +41 76 699 77 78

info@deltalektorat.ch | www.deltalektorat.ch