

## Faculty of Business and Law

### Assignment Brief Mode E and R Regulations

<b>Module Title:</b>	The Global Business Environment – Evolution and Dynamics	<b>Assignment Number</b>	Coursework 2
<b>Module Code:</b>	7042SSL	<b>Assignment Title</b>	Individual Report
<b>Module Leader:</b>	Dr Kiev Ariza	<b>Assignment Credits</b>	10 credits

<b>Release Date:</b>	12/ 09 / 2022
<b>Submission Date/Time:</b>	05 / 12 / 2022 18:00
<b>Submission Time and Place:</b>	Submission through Turnitin ONLY

#### Assessment Information

This assignment is an **INDIVIDUAL** assignment.

This assignment requires you to write a 2000-word individual report on the following question:

Critically assess the main power resources relevant to the bargaining relationship between States and multinational corporations. Illustrate your answer with reference to the **OIL** industry.

In writing your answer **you need to refer to the diagram on page 244** of the core module text book: P.Dicken, Global Shift: Mapping the Changing Contours of the World Economy (7th edition), London: SAGE. Please note, however, that it is essential this is supplemented from material from the reading lists provided on Aula and from your own independent research.

In preparing your answer you may find it helpful to reflect on some of the following questions (please note the report does not require you to answer these questions, they are merely to stimulate your thinking):

- What resources do States have that MNCs want? Conversely what resources do MNCs have that states want?
- How can States use their resources to exert power over MNCs and vice versa?
- Under what circumstances (or 'contingency' to borrow the term we use in the lectures) do these resources generate the most power? For example, a key power resource available to States in many industries is that they control access to their domestic market. Which States are likely to have the most power in this regard and why?

- What constraints do States and MNCs face in their bargaining relationship?
- Does the power of States and MNCs vary over time?

### Criteria for Assessment

Criteria	Mark
Identify and outline power resources pertinent to the States-MNC bargaining relationship	30%
Critical analysis of the powers resources of States and multinational corporations and application to the case study industry	50%
Research	10%
Referencing	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

This assignment is designed to assess learning outcomes 1,3,4, and 5:

1. Critically engage with competing explanations for economic globalisation since 1945.
2. Critically assess the role of multinational corporations in the development and operation of global markets for resources, goods and services.
3. Analyse the global business environment in different industrial sectors and evaluate the strategies corporations deploy to manage those environments.
4. Demonstrate understanding of the global business environment by communicating, both verbally and in writing, complex ideas and arguments about the evolution and dynamics of the world economy.
5. Locate, identify and synthesise appropriate information to design, conduct and report research into business and management issues, both individually and as part of a team.

### Word Count

The word count is 2000.

There will be a penalty of a deduction of 10% of the mark (after internal moderation) for work exceeding the word limit by 10% or more.

The word limit includes quotations and citations, but excludes the references list.

### How to submit your assessment

The assessment must be submitted by **18:00 on 05 / 12 / 2022**. No paper copies are required. You can access the submission link through the module web.

- Your coursework will be given a zero mark if you do not submit a copy through Turnitin. Please take care to ensure that you have fully submitted your work.
- Please ensure that you have submitted your work using the correct file format, unreadable files will receive a mark of zero. The Faculty accepts Microsoft Office and PDF documents, unless otherwise advised by the module leader.
- All work submitted after the submission deadline without a valid and approved reason (see below) will be given a mark of zero.

- The University wants you to do your best. However, we know that sometimes events happen which mean that you can't submit your coursework by the deadline – these events should be beyond your control and not easy to predict. If this happens, you can apply for an extension to your deadline for up to **five working days**, or if you need longer, you can apply for a deferral, which takes you to the next assessment period (for example, to the resit period following the main Assessment Boards). You must apply before the deadline.  
You will find information about the process and what is or is not considered to be an event beyond your control at <https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/Pages/Deferrals-and-Extension.aspx>
- Students MUST keep a copy and/or an electronic file of their assignment.
- Checks will be made on your work using anti-plagiarism software and approved plagiarism checking websites.

## **GUIDELINES AND BACKGROUND TO THIS ASSIGNMENT**

### **Plagiarism**

As part of your study you will be involved in carrying out research and using this when writing up your coursework. It is important that you correctly acknowledge someone else's writing, thoughts or ideas and that you do not attempt to pass this off as your own work. Doing so is known as plagiarism. It is not acceptable to copy from another source without acknowledging that it is someone else's writing or thinking. This includes using paraphrasing as well as direct quotations. You are expected to correctly cite and reference the works of others. The Centre for Academic Writing provides documents to help you get this right. If you are unsure, please visit [www.coventry.ac.uk/caw](http://www.coventry.ac.uk/caw). You can also check your understanding of academic conduct by completing the Good Academic Practice quiz.

#### Self-plagiarism or reuse of work previously submitted

You must not submit work for assessment that you have already submitted (partially or in full), either for your current course or for another qualification of this and any other university, unless this is specifically provided for in your assignment brief or specific course or module information. Where earlier work by you is citable, i.e. it has already been published/submitted, you must reference it clearly. Identical pieces of work submitted concurrently will also be considered to be self-plagiarism. Self-plagiarism is unacceptable because you cannot gain credit for the same work twice.

The University VLE includes a plagiarism detection system and assessors are experienced enough to recognise plagiarism when it occurs. Copying another student's work, using previous work of your own or copying large sections from a book or the internet are examples of plagiarism and carry serious consequences. If you are a business student and joined Coventry University in September 2020 or later please use APA 7th edition referencing, if you joined prior to this date you may use APA or the existing Harvard Reference Style (Coventry version) that you are familiar with. Law students should use OSCOLA. Please be consistent in the referencing style that you use and use it correctly to avoid a case of plagiarism or cheating being brought. If you are unsure, please contact the Centre for Academic Writing, your Progress Coach or a member of the course team.

### **Return of Marked Work**

You can expect to have marked work returned to you within **10 working days**. If for any reason there is a delay you will be kept informed. Marks and feedback will be provided online. As always, marks

This document is for Coventry University students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module and should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. Any infringements of this rule should be reported to [acreg.fbl@coventry.ac.uk](mailto:acreg.fbl@coventry.ac.uk)

will have been internally moderated only, and will therefore be provisional; your mark will be formally agreed later in the year once the external examiner has completed his / her review.

## Marking criteria

<b>Module Title:</b>	The Global Business Environment – Evolution and Dynamics	<b>Assignment Number</b>	2
<b>Module Code:</b>	7042SSL	<b>Assignment Title</b>	Report
<b>Module Leader:</b>	Dr Kiev Ariza	<b>Assignment Weighting</b>	10 credits

	Grade Boundary						
Assessment Criteria or Element	0-19%	20-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-100%
<b>Identify and outline power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship (30%)</b>	Very poor/No evidence. Fails to identify any power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship. Little or no attempt even to describe these resources.	Poor/Inadequate attempt to identify power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship. A few resources are identified but are poorly understood.	Satisfactory attempt to identify power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. Some factors outlined in a superficial manner. Several important factors omitted or misunderstood.	Good attempt to identify power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. Most key factors identified but understanding uneven and superficial in places.	Very good attempt to identify power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. Most key factors identified and well understood. Minor errors and omissions.	Excellent overview of power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship. All key factors relevant to the case study outlined succinctly and accurately.	Outstanding. Sophisticated and nuanced overview of power resources pertinent to the state-MNC bargaining relationship. All factors relevant to the case study outlined succinctly and accurately with a degree of original insight.
<b>Critical analysis of the power resources of states and multinational corporations and application to the case study industry (50%)</b>	Very poor/No evidence. An almost completely irrelevant answer. No attempt to analyse power resources or relate them to the case study. Little or no evidence of	Poor/Inadequate. Unclear, unfocused or illogical answer with little attempt at analysis of the MNC-state bargaining relationship. Narrative drifts	Satisfactory. Unclear, ill focused or illogical analysis. of the MNC-state bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. No sustained attempt to identify and analyse the contingency of the factors that produce power for states	Good. Reasonably clear, fairly well focused and generally coherent analysis of the MNC-state bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. No	Very good. Clear, well focused analysis of the MNC-state bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. Attempts to analyse the contingency of the factors that produce power for states and MNCs but not always in a logical or	Excellent. Clear, focused and logical analysis of the MNC-state bargaining relationship in the context of the case study. Thorough analysis of the contingency	Outstanding. Exceptionally clear, sharply focused and incisive analysis of the MNC-state bargaining relationship in the context of the case study.

	understanding of the topic.	from the question and/or talks in general terms about state-MNC relationships. Little application to the case study.	and MNCs. Narrative tends to talk in general terms about states and MNCs rather than analyse their relationship. Significant omissions and failure to explain how points relate to the question.	sustained attempt to identify and analyse the contingency of the factors that produce power for states and MNCs. Satisfactory grasp of the topic but some significant omissions and failure to explain how points relate to the question.	sustained manner. Sound understanding of the topic and associated literature but some minor misunderstandings.	of the factors that produce power for states and MNCs. Shows wide understanding of the topic and associated literature	Sophisticated analysis of the contingency of the factors that produce power for states and MNCs. Evidence of original thinking and ability to integrate this approach within the wider literature.
<b>Research (10%)</b>	No evidence of research. Report totally unsubstantiated by reliable evidence.	Poor/Inadequate levels of research. Rarely are the Report 's arguments substantiated by reliable evidence.	Satisfactory research. Research limited to the core sources. Lots of unsubstantiated assertions and evidence of dubious provenance.	Good research. Research limited to the core sources and little else. Report is now always supported by evidence. Evidence not always relevant or contemporary.	Very good research. Shows familiarity with the main sources and limited evidence of independent research. Arguments normally supported by relevant evidence but some unsubstantiated assertions/weak sources.	Excellent research. Evidence of independent research in in breadth and depth. Report is supported by extensive, relevant, and contemporary evidence. Occasional unsubstantiated assertions.	Outstanding research. Evidence of extensive independent research in in breadth and depth. Report is supported by extensive, relevant, and contemporary evidence.
<b>Referencing (10%)</b>	Very poor/No evidence of references and bibliography. Report is largely (or totally) devoid of references and bibliography.	Poor/Inadequate referencing and bibliography. Minimal understanding of professional referencing conventions. Bibliography incomplete and inconsistent.	Satisfactory referencing and bibliography. Uneven understanding or professional referencing. Bibliography and references inconsistent, incomplete and incoherent.	Good referencing and bibliography. Uneven understanding of professional referencing conventions. Inconsistencies in bibliographic entries/use of references.	Very good referencing and bibliography. Most academic conventions applied but some misunderstanding of professional referencing conventions.	Excellent referencing and bibliography. A few minor errors that would not appear in professional publications.	Outstanding referencing and bibliography in line with current professional standards.