



## BM134 Strategy & Leadership

### Diet 1

### 2023-24

Assignment medium:	Analytical report. ELS guide to report-writing is available at <a href="https://www.qmu.ac.uk/study-here/student-services/effective-learning-service-els/report-writing/">https://www.qmu.ac.uk/study-here/student-services/effective-learning-service-els/report-writing/</a> .
Weighting:	100%.
Anonymous marking:	Yes. The student's name must NOT appear anywhere in the report.
Word limit:	4,000 words (+10%). Prioritisation and succinctness are key elements of scholarship. Details of penalties for breaching word limits are available at <a href="https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/general-assessment-regulations/">https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/general-assessment-regulations/</a> (clause 20). In-text citations ARE included in your word count. The reference list at the end does NOT count towards the word limit.
Number of references:	At least 20 sources must be cited.
Referencing:	Harvard Referencing System (as per Cite Them Right) <a href="https://www.citethemrightonline.com/category-list?docid=CTRHarvard">https://www.citethemrightonline.com/category-list?docid=CTRHarvard</a> . Free and open-source reference-management tool Zotero <a href="https://www.zotero.org/">https://www.zotero.org/</a> is strongly recommended. The Library's guide to Zotero is available at <a href="https://libguides.qmu.ac.uk/referencing/zotero">https://libguides.qmu.ac.uk/referencing/zotero</a> . Zotero citation style: <i>Elsevier – Harvard (with titles)</i> .

<p>Format:</p>	<p>Filename: The filename should simply be the author's "matriculation number", e.g., "12345678.docx".</p> <p>Page border: None.</p> <p>Page margins: 1-inch on each side (top, bottom, left, right). To set page margins in Word, see <a href="https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/change-the-margins-in-your-word-document-c95c1ea1-70b1-4dde-a1da-f5aa2042c829">https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/change-the-margins-in-your-word-document-c95c1ea1-70b1-4dde-a1da-f5aa2042c829</a>.</p> <p>Page header: All pages should include the module code, module name, and focal company name in their respective page headers, e.g., "BM134 Strategy &amp; Leadership, Company X". To insert a page header in Word, see <a href="https://support.microsoft.com/en-gb/office/insert-a-header-or-footer-d832a10c-cf2e-4cff-988a-02bd582db12f">https://support.microsoft.com/en-gb/office/insert-a-header-or-footer-d832a10c-cf2e-4cff-988a-02bd582db12f</a>.</p> <p>Page numbers: All pages must include page numbers in the "Page x of y" format at bottom-right corner. To set page numbers in Word, see <a href="https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/add-page-number-x-of-y-to-your-document-8ae4eb1c-95d5-4fe1-b82d-de2873059355">https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/add-page-number-x-of-y-to-your-document-8ae4eb1c-95d5-4fe1-b82d-de2873059355</a>.</p> <p>Text Styles: To create, customise and use Word's Styles feature, see <a href="https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/customize-or-create-new-styles-d38d6e47-f6fc-48eb-a607-1eb120dec563">https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/customize-or-create-new-styles-d38d6e47-f6fc-48eb-a607-1eb120dec563</a> and <a href="https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/add-a-heading-3eb8b917-56dc-4a17-891a-a026b2c790f2">https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/add-a-heading-3eb8b917-56dc-4a17-891a-a026b2c790f2</a>.</p> <p>Font: Garamond or Apple Garamond.</p> <p>Alignment: Left (align left, rag right, do NOT justify).</p> <p>Italics: No.</p> <p>Size:</p> <p>Normal Text: 12 pt, NOT bold.</p> <p>Heading level 1: 18 pt, Bold.</p> <p>Heading level 2: 16 pt, Bold.</p> <p>Heading level 3: 14 pt, Bold.</p> <p>Heading level 4: 12 pt, Bold.</p> <p>Heading level 5: 12 pt, Bold Italic.</p>
----------------	--

Front cover sheet:	None.
Submission medium:	<p>Electronic submission via Dropbox in <i>Canvas &gt; Course &gt; Assignments</i>.</p> <p>Only in Microsoft Word .DOCX file format – the Dropbox will NOT accept PDF or other non-DOCX files.</p> <p>For technical issues with submission, please contact the School Office at <a href="mailto:academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk">academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk</a>.</p>
Submission date:	<p>4 p.m., Wednesday, the 17<sup>th</sup> of April 2024.</p> <p>Details of penalties for late submission are available at <a href="https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/general-assessment-regulations/">https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/general-assessment-regulations/</a> (clause 20).</p> <p>Module Coordinators can NOT grant exceptions or extensions.</p> <p>For Extenuating Circumstances policy and application procedure, please see <a href="https://www.qmu.ac.uk/current-students/current-students-general-information/manage-your-studies/extenuating-circumstances/">https://www.qmu.ac.uk/current-students/current-students-general-information/manage-your-studies/extenuating-circumstances/</a>.</p>

## Table of Contents

BM134 Strategy & Leadership Diet 1 2023-24.....	1
The Assignment.....	6
Choosing your focal organisation.....	6
Marking Criteria.....	6
Marking Rubric.....	7
Structuring Guide.....	13
Illustrative structure.....	14
Executive Summary.....	14
Formatting Guide.....	14
File settings.....	14
Page settings.....	14
Style & formatting.....	14
Descriptions.....	15
Academic integrity.....	15
References and Citations.....	16
Workshops.....	16
Zotero.....	16
Primary sources.....	17
Secondary sources.....	17
Lectures and Lecture slides.....	17
Statista.....	17
Tertiary sources.....	17
YouTube.....	17
Foreign sources.....	17
Quoting sources.....	18
Figures.....	18
Lists.....	18
Grades and Feedback.....	18
Diets 2 and 3.....	18
QMU's Postgraduate Grade Descriptors.....	18
Grade A* 80% and above Outstanding performance, exceptionally able – pass.....	19
Grade A 70-79.9% Very good performance – pass.....	19

Grade B 60-69.9% Good performance – pass .....	20
Grade C 50-59.9% - Fair performance – pass .....	20
Grade D 40-49.9% Unsatisfactory performance – fail .....	21
Grade E 0-39.9% Unsatisfactory performance - fail .....	21

## The Assignment

Write an analytical strategy report about your chosen organisation. Assess its current situation, identify the key strategic issues faced by it, make clear strategic recommendations that can provide it a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run, and develop a plan to manage the process of change.

### Choosing your focal organisation

Any type of an organisation is acceptable, whether a for-profit company, a non-profit organisation, a sports team, or a government department, etc.

However, in choosing the organisation, you must ensure that extensive information about it is available publicly and readily so that you can cite the public sources of information from which you are quoting – please familiarise yourself with the “References and Citations” section to ensure there is adequate information available about your chosen organisation from acceptable sources. Based on the aforementioned criteria, students *usually* find that publicly-listed companies, i.e., those listed on a stock exchange, make good targets.

You may NOT choose an organisation that has been chosen by one of your classmates. Please notify the Module Coordinator (and classmates) of your choice of organisation by signing up at [https://qmu-my.sharepoint.com/:x/g/personal/vpundir\\_qmu\\_ac\\_uk/EQQ3UNFQzt1Ioym8qdpPOwEB1dIA4dOKI1LDFUp9aid0uA?e=8eSoxM](https://qmu-my.sharepoint.com/:x/g/personal/vpundir_qmu_ac_uk/EQQ3UNFQzt1Ioym8qdpPOwEB1dIA4dOKI1LDFUp9aid0uA?e=8eSoxM) by 4pm on the 12<sup>th</sup> of February 2024.

## Marking Criteria

This summative assessment will be graded. The following marking criteria will be used:

Criterion	Weight (%)	Description
Executive Summary	5	A concise summary of the report that provides an overview of the purpose and main points of the report, including the recommendation(s).
External Analysis	15	An analysis of the focal organisation’s external environment, (e.g., the macro-environment, strategy, and/ or market), backed by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation (supported by appropriate referencing).
Internal Analysis	15	A resource-based analysis of the focal organisation, backed by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation (supported by appropriate referencing).
Strategic Choices	20	Identification of strategic issues and generation of strategic options, backed by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and

		models and persuasive argumentation (supported by appropriate referencing).
Recommendation(s)	20	A critical evaluation of the generated strategic options and selection of strategic recommendation(s), backed by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation (supported by appropriate referencing).
Strategy in Action	25	A formulation of the key considerations for the implementation roadmap of recommended strategy(ies), taking into account key configuration, change context and type, backed by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation (supported by appropriate referencing).

## Marking Rubric

The following rubric explains it will be graded.

Appropriate choice of strategic frameworks used to provide a strategic evaluation of the chosen organisation. Rationale is provided for the choice of frameworks used. Frameworks are applied to the organisation using examples, facts and evidence to support the analysis. Strategic evaluation considers the practicalities of the organisation operating in its current industry.

Criterion	Maximum points	Evaluation	Points achieved
Executive Summary	5	Outstanding: Clear and concise summary of all the findings and recommendations within the word limit (+10%).	4.0+
		Very good summary of most of the findings and recommendations within the word limit (+10%).	3.5-3.9
		Good summary of the findings and recommendations within the word limit (+10%).	3.0-3.4
		Fair summary of the findings and recommendations; overruns the word limit by up to 20%.	2.5-2.9
		Unsatisfactory summary of the findings and recommendations; missing some key findings or recommendations, and/or overruns the word limit by more than 20%.	2.0-2.4
		Missing Executive Summary, or Poor summary of the findings and recommendations; missing key findings or	0.0-1.9

		recommendations, and/or overruns the word limit by more than 20%.	
External Analysis	15	Outstanding, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	12.0+
		Very good, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	10.5-11.9
		Good, mostly well-supported, mostly evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	9.0-10.4
		Fair, often well-supported, often evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	7.5-8.9
		Unsatisfactory, sometimes well-supported, sometimes evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	6.0-7.4
		Missing or Poor application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and	0.0-5.9



		appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	
Internal Analysis	15	Outstanding, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	12.0+
		Very good, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	10.5-11.9
		Good, mostly well-supported, mostly evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	9.0-10.4
		Fair, often well-supported, often evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	7.5-8.9
		Unsatisfactory, sometimes well-supported, sometimes evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	6.0-7.4
		Missing or Poor application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant	0.0-5.9

		concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	
Strategic Choices	20	Outstanding, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	16.0+
		Very good, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	14.0-15.9
		Good, mostly well-supported, mostly evidence-backed application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	12.0-13.9
		Fair, often well-supported, often evidence-backed application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	10.0-11.9
		Unsatisfactory, sometimes well-supported, sometimes evidence-backed application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from	8.0-9.9

		previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	
		Missing or Poor application and analysis that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	0.0-7.9
Recommendation(s)	20	Outstanding, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	16.0+
		Very good, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	14.0-15.9
		Good, mostly well-supported, mostly evidence-backed application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and	12.0-13.9

		appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	
		Fair, often well-supported, often evidence-backed application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	10.0-11.9
		Unsatisfactory, sometimes well-supported, sometimes evidence-backed application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	8.0-9.9
		Missing or Poor application and analysis in developing strategic recommendations to provide the focal organisation a sustained competitive advantage over the long-run that directly and explicitly flows from previous analyses, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and discussion of the risks or shortcomings of the recommended path(s).	0.0-7.9
Strategy in Action	25	Outstanding, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	20.0+
		Very good, well-supported, evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical	17.5-19.9

		evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	
		Good, mostly well-supported, mostly evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or well-argued reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	15.0-17.4
		Fair, often well-supported, often evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	12.5-14.9
		Unsatisfactory, sometimes well-supported, sometimes evidence-backed application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	10.0-12.4
		Missing or Poor application and analysis, supported by critical evaluation of relevant concepts, theories, frameworks, tools and models and persuasive argumentation and appropriate referencing, and/ or reasons for the choice of framework(s)/ tool(s), and/ or discussion on the shortcomings of the approach.	0.0-9.9

## Structuring Guide

Cover sheet: NO cover sheet is needed or permitted.

Line spacing: 1.5 lines.

Appendices: NO appendices are permitted. If the information is important enough to be included in the report, it should be in the main report.

A logical progression that supports and grows the narrative is expected from the structure of the report. Here's an illustrative structure:

### Illustrative structure

- Executive Summary.
- Table of contents – to insert a table of contents in Word, see <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/insert-a-table-of-contents-882e8564-0edb-435e-84b5-1d8552ccf0c0>.
- Table of figures (charts, diagrams, illustrations, tables, etc.) – if any in the report. To insert a table of figures in Word, see <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/insert-a-table-of-figures-c5ea59c5-487c-4fb2-bd48-e34dd57f0ec1>.
- External analysis.
- Internal analysis.
- Strategic choices.
- Recommendation(s).
- Strategy in Action.
- Reference list - will not count towards the word limit.

### Executive Summary

An Executive Summary is required. The maximum permitted word limit for the Executive Summary is 200 words (+10%).

The Executive Summary is a brief and concise summary of the longer report – this is NOT an introduction to the report. It should provide an overview of the purpose and main points of the report, including the recommendation(s), allowing the reader to quickly become acquainted with the report without having to read the full report. Think of the Executive Summary as your “elevator pitch” to the CEO of your focal organisation.

### Formatting Guide

#### File settings

File format: Microsoft Word .DOCX format is the only acceptable file format for submissions.

Filename: The filename should simply be the author's “matriculation number”, e.g., “12345678.docx”.

#### Page settings

Page margins: 1-inch all around (top, bottom, left, right).

Page borders: NO page borders are permitted.

Page header: All pages should include the module code, module name, and focal company name in their respective page headers, e.g., “BM134 Strategy & Leadership, Company X”.

Page numbers: All pages should contain page numbers in “Page X of Y” format in their respective page footers.

#### Style & formatting

Please use Word's text Styles feature:

Normal: Garamond or Apple Garamond 12pt.

Heading level 1: Garamond or Apple Garamond 18pt Bold.

Heading level 2: Garamond or Apple Garamond 16pt Bold.

Heading level 3: Garamond or Apple Garamond 14pt Bold.

Heading level 4: Garamond or Apple Garamond 12pt Bold.

Heading level 5: Garamond or Apple Garamond 12pt Bold Italic.

Line spacing: 1.5 lines.

Alignment: Left.

Figures: All figures (charts, diagrams, illustrations, tables, etc.) in the report must be captioned. To insert captions in Word, see <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/add-format-or-delete-captions-in-word-82fa82a4-f0f3-438f-a422-34bb5cef9c81>.

When the figure is obtained from a single source, the citation should be included in the caption. Similarly, when the figure is created by the author, based on data from a single source, the citation referring to the data source should be included in the caption.

## Descriptions

At SCQF Level 11, mere “description”, “comprehension” or simple “understanding” are not sufficient. Students are expected to demonstrate higher-level skills - see Bloom's taxonomy (analysis and above): <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/images/oed/ed/LearningOutcomes-bylevelandlanguageupdateJanuary2022.pdf>

This is reflected in the learning outcomes of this course.

Hence, please do not expend too much time, effort or word count into describing the frameworks and tools. Your understanding should shine through your application and critical analysis.

Specifically, you'd start with justifying why a certain framework, model or tool is appropriate to use in your particular organisation and situation, then you'd spend most of your time and effort into the application, and finally you'd wrap up with a discussion around the limitations of that particular approach.

## Academic integrity

The submission is expected to be the submitting student's own original work. By submitting the work, the student is assumed to undertake that it is so.

Dishonest practices such as copying, cheating, collusion, plagiarism (i.e., representing as your own, work that is not actually your own, e.g., work obtained, in whole or in part, from an essay bank, essay writing service, generative artificial intelligence, etc.) are serious academic offences and will incur appropriate penalties. Please familiarise yourself with the university's academic integrity policy at <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/plagiarism-policy/>.

Cases of academic dishonesty shall be referred to the university's disciplinary procedure. The outcome of such disciplinary proceedings can be very serious, up to and including withdrawal from the university.

## References and Citations

You will need to provide source references not just for theoretical concepts, but also as evidence for key factual claims. Usually, the evidence would be in the form of citations.

At QMU, the accepted citation style is Harvard. Please see the relevant Library Guide

<https://libguides.qmu.ac.uk/referencing> and CiteThemRight <https://www.citethemrightonline.com/category-list?docid=CTRHarvard>.

## Workshops

The Library's workshop sessions on referencing are highly recommended. The details and details of the sign up process can be found at

<https://qmu.libcal.com/calendar/workshops?cid=8135&t=d&d=0000-00-00&cal=8135&inc=0>.

## Zotero

It is strongly recommended that you use a reference manager such as the free and open-source Zotero <https://www.zotero.org/>. See the relevant Library Guide <https://libguides.qmu.ac.uk/referencing/zotero>. If using Zotero, then in the software, please choose the citation style *Elsevier – Harvard (with titles)*.

If you have not used a referencing tool like Zotero or Endnote before, please invest some time and effort in installing and learning it. It will save you a lot of pain, time and effort as you write your reports, essays and final dissertations.

In addition to Windows, Zotero is available for macOS

<https://www.zotero.org/download/client/dl?channel=release&platform=mac&version=6.0.30>, iOS <https://apps.apple.com/us/app/zotero/id1513554812> and Linux

[https://www.zotero.org/download/client/dl?channel=release&platform=linux-x86\\_64&version=6.0.30](https://www.zotero.org/download/client/dl?channel=release&platform=linux-x86_64&version=6.0.30), and plugs into Word, Google Docs and Libre Office

[https://www.zotero.org/support/word\\_processor\\_integration](https://www.zotero.org/support/word_processor_integration). It also has browser connectors for Chrome <https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/ekhagklcjbdpajgpjgmbionohlpdbjgc>, Edge

<https://microsoftedge.microsoft.com/addons/detail/nmhdhpihbnnopknkmonacoephklnflpho>, Firefox <https://www.zotero.org/download/connector/dl?browser=firefox&version=5.0.114>

and Safari (Safari connector is built into the Mac version of Zotero and doesn't need to be installed separately) to automatically extract citation information from webpages and storing them into your reference database.

Once set up, Zotero will ensure that you are consistent and compliant with the required style so that you don't have to think about manually formatting the reference list (or in-line citations, for that matter).

Further, any sources you have stored in your Zotero database can be re-used in other documents and reports with just a click.

In short, over the course of your programme, Zotero (or another citation manager such as EndNote <https://endnote.com/?language=en> or Mendeley <https://www.mendeley.com/>) can save you much effort and many hours.



## Primary sources

Credible primary sources are always acceptable. Examples include company Annual Reports, academic papers published in peer-reviewed journals, government reports, reports by industry associations, reports by universities, textbooks, popular books published by credible publishers, such as Blackwell, Bloomsbury, Cambridge, Edward Elgar, Harvard, MIT, Oxford, Palgrave MacMillan, Pearson, Penguin, Prentice Hall, Random House, Reuters, Routledge/ Taylor and Francis, Simon & Schuster, Springer, Stanford, Wiley, Yale etc., popular press articles published in credible periodicals such as BBC, Financial Times, The Guardian, The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, etc., primary research by credible organisations, such as Economist Intelligence Unit, Euromonitor, Gallup, IBIS World, Insider Intelligence, The World Bank, etc.

Please exercise judgement when using *Advertorials* or *Sponsored Content* that appear even in credible publications, as well as press releases syndicated by the likes of PRWire - if you are trying to demonstrate a company's actions or position in objective terms, these sources would NOT *usually* be acceptable. But if your goal is to showcase what they company was saying about itself or its strategy, these sources would be fine.

## Secondary sources

Students often struggle with the correct way to deal with secondary sources. To understand how to handle these, see this guide: <https://libguides.ucd.ie/harvardstyle/secondarysources>

## Lectures and Lecture slides

Lectures and Lecture slides are NOT acceptable sources.

## Statista

In *most* cases, Statista is an image source, not a primary source of data or important information. In other words, it is usually a secondary source, and should be dealt with as per the guidance at <https://libguides.ucd.ie/harvardstyle/secondarysources> - it should NOT be used as a reliable reference.

## Tertiary sources

Tertiary sources such as Wikipedia, Investopedia, SimilarWeb, etc., are NOT acceptable. See this Wikipedia article [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Academic\\_use](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Academic_use).

## YouTube

Social media, personal blogging, micro-blogging, podcasting and video-blogging sites such as Facebook, Tiktok, Blogspot, Wordpress, Medium, X, Prezi, Slideshare, YouTube, Rumble, and Vimeo, etc., *usually* fall within the definition of tertiary sources, and as such are not acceptable.

However, in very specific cases, these may be acceptable, e.g., a company's official Facebook channel or YouTube channel will have the same weight as its conventional press release. Similarly, a government's official X account post would be acceptable as an indication of the respective government's stance.

## Foreign sources

Credible non-UK sources are acceptable – please see “Primary sources”, “Secondary sources”, and “Tertiary sources” above. However, any such sources must be accessible from the UK; for instance, if an online Russian source is not accessible from the UK due to sanctions, then it will

not be acceptable. Finally, only those foreign sources are acceptable that are published in the English language.

### Quoting sources

When quoting a cited reference, please ensure that the quoted text is clearly indicated as a quotation by italicising and circumscribing it within the double quotation marks, e.g., “*Quotation*”.

The use of quotations should be minimal, and such quotations should generally be short. Extended quotations or extensive use of quotations will be counterproductive.

### Figures

When the figure is obtained from a single source, the citation should be included in the caption. Similarly, when the figure is created by the author, based on data from a single source, the citation should be included in the caption.

If different parts of the figure draw from different sources, then the citations should be included in the respective parts.

### Lists

When all items of an ordered (numbered) or unordered (bulleted) list are drawn from a single source, the citation should be made at the end of the introduction to the list, i.e., before the list starts.

### Grades and Feedback

To view your grades and feedback, please follow the guide provided at [https://canvas.qmu.ac.uk/courses/188/pages/7-dot-1-%7C-grades-and-feedback?module\\_item\\_id=3942](https://canvas.qmu.ac.uk/courses/188/pages/7-dot-1-%7C-grades-and-feedback?module_item_id=3942)

Specifically for Rubric Feedback, please follow the guidelines at [https://canvas.qmu.ac.uk/courses/188/pages/7-dot-4-%7C-rubrics?module\\_item\\_id=3947](https://canvas.qmu.ac.uk/courses/188/pages/7-dot-4-%7C-rubrics?module_item_id=3947)

If you have problems accessing your grades and/ or feedback for the submissions, please contact the School Office at [academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk](mailto:academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk).

### Diets 2 and 3

Submissions in Diets 2 and 3 will include *viva voce* based on the written submission. Any submissions will have to focus on a different organisation than the one chosen in the previous Diet.

Maximum achievable marks in Diets 2 and 3 are capped at 50%.

If you have any questions, please contact the School Office at [academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk](mailto:academicadministration@qmu.ac.uk).

### QMU's Postgraduate Grade Descriptors

Up to date and authoritative grade descriptors are available at: <https://www.qmu.ac.uk/about-the-university/quality/committees-regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulations-policies-and-procedures/general-assessment-regulations/>

Indicative grade descriptors are provided below for your convenience:

### **Grade A\* 80% and above Outstanding performance, exceptionally able – pass**

- Articulates an outstanding critical understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and principles presented by the assessment.
- Articulates an outstanding critical understanding that integrates most, if not all, of the main areas of the specialist discipline.
- Demonstrates outstanding, extensive, detailed and critical knowledge, informed by current discipline developments.
- Displays an outstanding ability to critically appraise scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Applies a range of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Demonstrates an outstanding ability to communicate knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates an outstanding critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Shows an outstanding reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Demonstrates outstanding originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays outstanding potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.

### **Grade A 70-79.9% Very good performance – pass**

- Articulates a very good critical understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and principles presented by the assessment.
- Articulates a very good critical understanding that integrates most of the main areas of the specialist discipline.
- Demonstrates very good, extensive, detailed and critical knowledge, informed by current discipline developments.
- Displays a very good ability to critically appraise scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Applies a range of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Demonstrates a very good ability to communicate knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates a very good critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Shows a very good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Demonstrates very good originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays very good potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.

### **Grade B 60–69.9% Good performance – pass**

- Articulates a good critical understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and principles presented by the assessment.
- Articulates a good critical understanding that integrates some of the main areas of the specialist discipline.
- Demonstrates good breadth, detailed and critical knowledge, informed by current discipline developments.
- Displays good ability to critically appraise scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Applies a range of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Demonstrates a good ability to communicate knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates a good critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Shows a good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Demonstrates good originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays good potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.

### **Grade C 50–59.9% – Fair performance – pass**

- Articulates a fair critical understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and principles presented by the assessment.
- Articulates a fair, critical understanding that integrates a few of the main areas of the specialist discipline.
- Demonstrates a fair breadth, detailed and critical knowledge, informed by current discipline developments.
- Displays a fair ability to critically appraise scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Applies a range of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Demonstrates a fair ability to communicate knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates a fair critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Shows a fair reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Demonstrates fair originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays fair potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.
- Submission/assessment meets the standards of SCQF Level 11.

### **Grade D 40–49.9% Unsatisfactory performance – fail**

- Partial knowledge, understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and current discipline developments.
- Partial understanding of the breadth and depth of the discipline.
- Limited ability to critically appraise scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Insufficient application of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Demonstrates insufficient ability to communicate knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates a limited critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Shows insufficient reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Partial demonstration of originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays limited potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.
- Submission/assessment does not meet the standards of SCQF Level 11.

### **Grade E 0–39.9% Unsatisfactory performance – fail**

- Little or no understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, principal theories, concepts and current discipline developments.
- Little or no understanding of the breadth and depth of the discipline.
- Inaccurate appraisal of scholarship and evidence, and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory.
- Ineffective application of specialist and/or professional skills, techniques or practices aligned with the discipline.
- Ineffective communication of knowledge (written, verbal, practical, visual).
- Demonstrates little or no critical awareness of the scope and application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.
- Consistent lack of reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embodied in the subject.
- Little or no demonstration of originality, creativity or innovation in the application of knowledge and / or practice.
- Displays little or no potential to undertake research or be a leading practitioner within a specialist area.
- Submission/assessment does not meet the standards of SCQF Level 11.