

TECHNICAL ALIGNMENT REVIEW

Dissertation Review: Coherence of RQs, Objectives, Literature, Methodology, Analysis and Discussion

*The Effects of Paying Services at a Public Hospital on Achieving Universal Health Coverage:
The Case Study of Ntcheu District and Zomba Central Hospitals*

Candidate: Kondwani C. Mangulenje (MA-PAM-18-22)
Programme: Master of Public Administration and Management
Review date: 24 July 2026



NOT READY FOR SUBMISSION

4 critical issues and 5 moderate issues were found across 11 review points. Three of the critical issues are internal contradictions (methodology promises vs. what Chapter 4 actually delivers, and front-matter vs. actual structure) that an examiner is very likely to flag on first read.

2 Good / 5 Moderate / 4 Critical

Legend: **GOOD** = aligned, no action needed. **MODERATE** = weakens the thesis, fix before submission. **CRITICAL** = internal contradiction an examiner will likely catch, must fix.

Detailed Findings

#	Area	Verdict	Issues Found	Action Needed
1	RQ ↔ Objectives alignment	GOOD	The three specific research questions and three specific objectives correspond almost word-for-word (access/resource allocation, financial sustainability, quality of care).	None needed: this part is solid as is.
2	Objective 3 ↔ Analysis (staff motivation)	MODERATE	Objective 3 promises quality of care findings on "patient satisfaction,	Revise

#	Area	Verdict	Issues Found	Action Needed
			waiting times, availability of medical supplies, and staff motivation." Section 4.3.3 never reports staff motivation; it only appears under 4.3.2 (financial sustainability) instead.	
3	Objective 2 ↔ Analysis (financial data)	CRITICAL	Chapter 3 promises Objective 2 will be answered via review of financial records and non-parametric statistical tests. Section 4.3.2 contains no financial figures or trend statistics at all, only respondent perception narrative. The reported chi-square/t-test/Pearson results relate to access and quality, not finance.	Revise
4	Conceptual Framework use	MODERATE	The Kutzin & McIntyre framework is invoked with near-identical wording at the end of every discussion sub-section (5.1–5.5), reading as a repeated template rather than doing	Revise

#	Area	Verdict	Issues Found	Action Needed
			analytical work.	
5	Literature review: synthesis quality	MODERATE	Organised thematically (good), but within each theme it is mostly single-study reporting rather than genuine comparison or critique. No synthesis. No closing paragraph in Chapter 2 states the specific research gap this study fills.	Revise.
6	Literature review: citation integrity	CRITICAL	A cluster of citations reads as generic and unverifiable, such as "Smith (2019)", "Jones (2021)", "Williams (2020)", without institutional or study-design detail, unlike the more specific citations elsewhere.	Verify every "Smith/Jones/Williams"-style citation actually exists and says what is claimed. Replace unverifiable ones with real, checkable sources before submission.
7	Methodology: internal consistency	MODERATE	Section 3.8 names "narrative analysis" for qualitative data, but Table 1 and Chapter 4 both use thematic analysis instead. Sample size is written as "forty (80)", two different	Revise

#	Area	Verdict	Issues Found	Action Needed
			figures used interchangeably.	
8	Front matter ↔ actual structure	CRITICAL	Section 1.6 says the dissertation has five chapters and that Chapter Four covers "data analysis, findings, and discussion", but the actual document has six chapters with Findings and Discussion split. The Table of Contents also lists Objectives before Research Questions, reversed from the actual body order.	Revise
9	Discussion chapter: structure	GOOD	Correctly organised by objective (5.1 access, 5.2 finance, 5.3 quality), with two justified extra sections (5.4 equity, 5.5 framework linkage) for a cross-cutting finding.	Keep this shape: no structural change needed.
10	Discussion chapter: interpretive depth	MODERATE	Every section follows an almost identical pattern (finding → cited agreement → same framework sentence). Genuinely	Revise

#	Area	Verdict	Issues Found	Action Needed
			surprising findings, such as the 25 vs 130 minute waiting-time gap, are re-described rather than interpreted.	
1 1	Overall thesis connectivity (RQ→Objectives→Methods→Findings→Discussion→Conclusion)	CRITICAL	The chain holds reasonably for Objectives 1 and 3, but breaks at Objective 2: the promised financial-record method never appears in the findings, so Chapter 5's financial-sustainability discussion rests on data the methodology chapter didn't originally scope for that objective.	Revise.

Priority Order for Revision

1. **[CRITICAL]** Fix the Objective 2 method/finding mismatch: present real financial data or revise the methodology text to match what was delivered.
2. **[CRITICAL]** Correct the front matter: chapter count in Section 1.6, and the Table of Contents order/numbering.
3. **[CRITICAL]** Verify or replace unverifiable literature citations ("Smith", "Jones", "Williams"-style references).
4. **[CRITICAL]** Reconnect the overall RQ → Objectives → Methods → Findings → Discussion chain for Objective 2 specifically.
5. **[MODERATE]** Deepen literature synthesis (comparison/critique) and add an explicit research-gap statement.
6. **[MODERATE]** Restore the missing staff-motivation finding under Objective 3.
7. **[MODERATE]** Reduce repetition in the framework linkage across Chapter 5 and add real interpretation of standout findings.
8. **[MODERATE]** Tidy internal methodology inconsistencies (narrative vs. thematic analysis; sample-size figure).

Once the eight critical to moderate items above are resolved, this dissertation is structurally close to submission-ready. The objectives, questions, and discussion chapter are well-scaffolded; the remaining work is reconciling a few chapters that were edited at different times.

The good parts will also change in relation to changes that are made above, Revise the whole thesis need update