

THESIS CHECK

Feedback for Maria Müller

Note: This is an illustrative sample report designed to give you an impression of the depth and style of the feedback before placing your order. Your own report will assess your thesis individually based on the same six categories.



REVIEWED BY

Dr. Meriton Ceka

Coaching, editing & proofreading

Language & Style

Improvement recommended

The language is generally clear and predominantly appropriate for academic writing. However, the wording could be made more precise and direct in several places. For example, one sentence reads: "The implementation of the introduction of guidelines for remote work led to a reduction in employee motivation." A more concise version would be: "The introduction of guidelines for remote work reduced employee motivation."

There are also recurring phrases and nominalisations that make some sections unnecessarily cumbersome. For example, the phrase "in the context of" is used fourteen times in Chapter 2. Such repetitions are not necessarily problematic in themselves, but their frequent use can affect the flow and readability of the text.

Recommendation: Focus in particular on revising complex sentence structures, recurring phrases, and unnecessary nominalisations. The aim is to achieve precise and readable academic language that communicates ideas as directly as possible. At the same time, ensure a consistent academic tone throughout the thesis.

Research Question & Focus

High need for action

The research question on p. 8 currently covers several dimensions: employee motivation, job satisfaction, productivity, and team culture. While these aspects are relevant in principle, combining them results in a relatively broad scope of investigation.

In addition, not all components of the research question are addressed equally in the conclusion. In particular, team culture, which is introduced as sub-question 3 on p. 9, is not explicitly answered in Section 6.1. This creates a discrepancy between the research topic announced at the beginning and the way the research question is ultimately answered.

Recommendation: Consider which dimensions are actually central to your research. If team culture remains part of the research question, it should be explicitly addressed both in the analysis and in the conclusion. Alternatively, the research question could be narrowed down further, for example: "How does remote work affect employee motivation in SMEs in Zurich?" The key point is to ensure that all aspects included in the research question are systematically examined throughout the thesis and explicitly addressed in the conclusion.

Structure & Coherence

Improvement recommended

The thesis generally has a clear and comprehensible structure. However, Chapter 3, “History of Digitalisation in Switzerland” (pp. 24–37), partly reads like a separate digression. While the background information it contains is relevant to the topic, its specific contribution to answering the research question and to the subsequent analysis remains unclear in some places.

This is particularly evident in the transition to Chapter 4. Several aspects introduced in the historical overview are not revisited in the subsequent analysis. As a result, the overall length of the thesis increases without all sections contributing equally to the central line of argument.

Recommendation: Consider shortening the historical overview and retaining only the material that directly supports your research question and subsequent analysis. Alternatively, you could clarify the purpose of the chapter at the outset and explicitly link its key findings to Chapter 4. A stronger transition would also help readers understand why this background is necessary for answering your research question.

Argumentation & Depth

Improvement recommended

The central line of argument — “remote work -> autonomy -> motivation” — is generally easy to follow. The connection between the interview findings and the role of perceived autonomy is particularly well established.

However, some conclusions are stated more strongly than the empirical evidence allows. For example, on p. 58, the thesis states: “The results clearly show that autonomy increases motivation.” In a qualitative study based on 12 interviews, such a statement should be phrased more cautiously. In addition, two participants report feelings of isolation on p. 55. These differing perspectives could be incorporated more explicitly into the interpretation.

Recommendation: Where appropriate, use more cautious academic formulations such as “suggest,” “indicate,” or “the findings point towards,” and briefly address the participants’ differing responses. This would strengthen rather than weaken the academic credibility of the argument. A strong thesis does not need to demonstrate that all findings support the same conclusion; it needs to show that different findings have been considered and appropriately contextualised.

Sources & Citation

High need for action

The literature base provides a solid foundation, but there is room for improvement in certain areas. For example, the statement on p. 15, "Studies consistently show that remote employees are more productive," is currently not supported by a citation. Particularly for general empirical claims, it should be clear what scientific evidence they are based on.

Furthermore, Chapter 2 shows a strong reliance on Müller (2019), which is cited a total of eight times. This creates the impression in some sections that the literature base is relatively narrow.

Recommendation: Review key factual and empirical claims to ensure that they are adequately supported by sources. Also pay attention to the currency, academic quality, and diversity of the literature. Finally, check the consistency between in-text citations or footnotes and the reference list. The goal is not to include as many sources as possible, but to ensure that the central claims of the thesis are transparent, traceable, and scientifically well supported.

Formatting & Layout

Solid foundation

Overall, the thesis is clearly structured and largely consistent in its formatting. Headings, body text, tables, and figures generally follow a logical structure and support readability. There are, however, a few minor formal inconsistencies. For example, the font type and/or font size on pp. 22 and 31 differs slightly from the rest of the body text. Some spacing and captions could also be standardised.

Recommendation: Conduct a final formatting check before submission and correct minor inconsistencies in font type and size, spacing, and table and figure captions. In particular, check that your university's formal requirements are followed consistently throughout the thesis.

Overall assessment

Your thesis addresses a relevant research question and already has a solid foundation. A particularly positive aspect is the clear connection between the theoretical literature and your own empirical findings. The central line of argument surrounding remote work, autonomy, and motivation runs coherently through substantial parts of the analysis.

The greatest potential for improvement currently lies in the focus of the thesis and in ensuring that its individual components are properly aligned. The research question, theoretical framework, analysis, discussion, and conclusion should build on one another as consistently as possible.

At the same time, a more differentiated interpretation of the findings, broader support for key claims through the literature, and a final linguistic and formal revision could further strengthen the academic quality of the thesis. The foundation is already there. With targeted revisions to the identified areas, the thesis can be further strengthened, particularly in terms of focus, coherence, and academic rigour.