

Faculty of Business and Law

Assignment Brief Mode E and R Regulations

Module Title:	Applied Marketing Analytics
Module Code:	7031SSL
Module Leader:	Dr Abdulrahman Al-Surmi

Assignment Number	Coursework 1 (Resit)
Assignment Title	The Analytics of Key Marketing Areas
Assignment Credits	10 Credits

Release Date:	15/03/2022
Submission Date/Time:	01/08/2022 18:00:00
Submission Time and Place:	Submission through Turnitin ONLY

Assessment Information

This coursework is designed to assess learning outcomes:

1. Understand and utilise major quantitative analytical tools that are used to gather and analyse marketing related research data.
2. To Interpret the results of marketing data analysis.
3. Critically evaluates findings, derive the implications of such findings and have an understanding of how these would be applied in a commercial environment.
4. Be critical consumers of existing and commissioned marketing research.

This coursework is an individual report.

Instructions to Students

Prepare a short report for an organisation of your choice. Your report should critically analyse and evaluate the organisation's data using Binary Logistic Regression Analysis.

As a detailed guide for your report you should consider the following:

1. **Overview:** An overview of the organisation and the scope of that marketing area discussing to what extent the marketing of the organisation is shaped and influenced by this function, and its contribution to organisational performance. (300 words)
2. **Summarising Marketing Data Obtained:** Use the dataset you have gathered to visualise the data using appropriate tables and graph as well as identifying and discussing the key variables to be considered. (500 words)
3. **Computing Binary Logistic Regression Analysis:** An analysis of the key variables identified using the binary logistic regression analysis technique as well as discussing the analytics capabilities of the organization. (700 words)
4. **Discussion and Evaluation of the Outcome:** Discussion of binary logistic regression analysis outcome employed in the organisation and explaining the predicted values. (700 words)
5. **Conclusions and Recommendations:** Conclude on your findings and make quantitative recommendations for improvement. (300 words)
6. **Reflective Account:** Identify the changes you have made to improve this work and what have you learned from this. (200 words)
7. **Presentation Style:** Present report in a professional manner, free-grammatical errors, and visually appealing.

Criteria for Assessment

This table details the weightings of the six criteria by which your work will be assessed.

Criteria	Marks
1. Overview	10%
2. Summarising Marketing Data Obtained	10%
3. Computing Binary Regression Analysis	25%
4. Discussion and Evaluation of the Outcome	20%
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	10%
6. Reflective	15%
7. Presentation Style	10%
Total	100%

Word Count

- The word count is 2700
- 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 **18:00:00 on 01/08/2022**. 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 two weeks, 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. You can also check your understanding of academic conduct by completing the Good Academic Practice quiz available.

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, ie. 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/in class/face to face**. As always, marks 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.

Banding	
90-100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional knowledge base exploring, critically analysing and evaluating the discipline and its theory with extraordinary originality and autonomy. • Demonstrates an exceptional command of relevant critical analytical and/or evaluative techniques, and the ability to apply these to new and/or abstract information and situations. Shows an exceptional appreciation of the limits and/or appropriate uses of particular analytical approaches, where relevant. Knowledge and understanding of theory, where relevant, is of an exceptional detail. High level of appreciation of the limits of theory demonstrated throughout the work, where relevant Approach to assessment task is clearly, appropriately and consistently theoretically informed across all relevant learning outcomes. • Exceptional exploration of wider academic sources with a high degree of independent learning which exceeds the assessment brief. Sources have been accurately interpreted and integrated with flawless synthesis, leading to innovative and interesting ideas. • Exceptional answer with coherent and logical presentation of ideas. The answer exhibits a clear argument/line of reasoning with flair and originality. Discipline specific vocabulary used with precision and academic style applied well throughout. No language errors present and referencing in the CU version of Harvard has been employed in an accurate manner. • Excellent presentation style. Student maintains good posture most of the time Occasional gestures that supplement and match verbal points. Student's graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation. Clear, legible, attractive, supplement and demonstrate key points.
80-89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding knowledge base exploring, critically analysing and evaluating the discipline and its theory with clear originality and autonomy. • Demonstrates an outstanding command of relevant critical and/or evaluative analytical techniques, and the ability to apply these to new and/or abstract information and situations. Shows an outstanding appreciation of the limits and/or appropriate uses of particular analytical approaches. Knowledge and understanding of theory, where relevant, is of an outstanding detail. Appreciation of the limits of theory demonstrated throughout the work. Approach to assessment task is clearly, appropriately and consistently theoretically informed across all relevant learning outcomes. • Outstanding exploration of wider academic sources with a high degree of independent learning which exceeds the assignment brief. Sources have been accurately interpreted and integrated with a high degree of synthesis, leading to innovative and interesting ideas. • Outstanding answer with coherent and logical presentation of ideas. The answer exhibits a clear argument/line of reasoning with flair and originality. Discipline specific vocabulary used with precision and academic style applied well throughout. No language errors present. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard has been employed in an accurate manner. • Outstanding presentation. Student maintains good posture most of the time, Occasional gestures that supplement and match verbal points. Student's graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation. Clear, legible, attractive, supplement and demonstrate key points.
70-79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge base that supports critical analysis and/or evaluation and problem-solving in theory and/or practice within the discipline, with considerable originality. • Makes excellent use of a range of relevant critical analysis and/or evaluative techniques, and applies these to new and/or abstract information and situations. Shows well developed ability to compare alternative theories and apply them to the context of the assessment task and all learning outcomes. Demonstrates a detailed, accurate, systematic theoretical understanding. Appropriately selected theoretical knowledge is integrated into the overall assessment task and all learning outcomes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent exploration of wider academic sources with evidence of independent learning which may exceed the assignment brief. Sources have been accurately interpreted and integrated, with accurate synthesis of research leading to original and interesting ideas. • Excellent answer with coherent and logical presentation of ideas. The answer exhibits a clear argument/line of reasoning with flair and originality. The answer is entirely relevant and focused. Discipline specific vocabulary used with precision and academic style applied well throughout. No language errors present. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard has been employed in an accurate manner. • Excellent presentation. Student maintains good posture most of the time, Occasional gestures that supplement and match verbal points. Student's graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation. Clear, legible, attractive, supplement and demonstrate key points.
60-69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good knowledge base that supports critical analysis and/or evaluation and problem-solving in theory and/or practice within the discipline, with some originality displayed. • Makes good use of established techniques of critical analysis and/or evaluation, relevant to the discipline. Shows a developing ability to compare alternative theories and/or analytical approaches, where relevant. Shows a systematic and accurate understanding of key theories, where relevant, which are appropriately applied within the context of the assessment task and learning outcomes. • Very good evidence of wider academic reading and independent learning. Sources have been accurately interpreted, integrated, with evidence of synthesis leading to original ideas. • Very good answer with coherent and logical presentation of ideas. The answer is relevant and focused with a clear argument/line of reasoning. Discipline specific vocabulary is used well and academic style applied throughout. Minor language errors may be present but do not impact on clarity of expression. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard is accurate. • Student presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow. Student's graphics relate to text and presentation. Explores and critically analyses key areas. Justified personal opinions/ideas. Very good recommendations, plans for improvement
50-59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge base that supports some critical analysis and/or evaluation and problem-solving in theory and/or practice within the discipline. • Good use of established techniques of critical analysis and/or evaluation, relevant to the discipline. Sound descriptive knowledge of key theories, where relevant, with some appropriate application • Good evidence of wider academic reading and independent learning. Sources have been interpreted and integrated, with some attempt at synthesis • Good answer with coherent and logical presentation. The answer is largely relevant but lacks focus at points. Evidence of an argument/line of reasoning. Discipline specific vocabulary is used and academic style applied throughout. Minimal language errors are present but does not impact on clarity. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard is mostly accurate. • Good knowledge of wider academic reading. Uses emphasis, pauses, and vocal changes to highlight words and potentiate audience response.
40-49%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge base demonstrating comprehension and formulation of basic knowledge with some omissions at the level of theoretical understanding. • Limited ability to discuss theory and solve problems within the discipline. • Makes satisfactory but limited use of established techniques of critical analysis and/or evaluation, relevant to the discipline. Selection of theory, where relevant, is satisfactory but application and/or understanding is limited. • Satisfactory evidence of wider academic reading, but with minimal attempt to move beyond the recommended texts. Interpretation of sources is acceptable, but there may be some instances of misunderstanding. Poor synthesis of theories and concepts within the discipline.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory answer with some attempt at coherence and logical presentation. The answer contains some irrelevant material and lacks focus at points. Some discipline specific vocabulary is used and an attempt at academic writing style is made. There is an attempt at an argument/ line of reasoning. Some language errors may be present which impacts on clarity at times. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard is mostly accurate but with some errors. • Student occasionally uses graphics that rarely support text and presentation. Illegible, inconsistent, irrelevant graphics. Student incorrectly pronounces terms.
35-39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes not or partially met. Restricted knowledge base. Limited understanding of discipline and ethical issues. Difficulty with linking theory and problem solving in discipline. • Attempts at critical analysis and/or evaluation are ineffective and/or uninformed by the discipline. Knowledge of theory inaccurate and/or incomplete, where relevant. Choice of theory inappropriate. Application and/or understanding is very limited. • Limited evidence of wider reading at an academic level. Sources used may be inappropriate and interpreted poorly. Little evidence of integration or synthesis of discipline specific theories and concepts. • Answer is limited and lacks coherence and logical presentation. The answer contains irrelevant material and lacks focus throughout with no argument/line of reasoning. Language errors are present and impact on clarity of expression. No attempt at using discipline specific vocabulary and inconsistent application of academic writing style. Referencing in the CU version of Harvard is inconsistent. • Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear. Speaking too fast or slow. Student uses superfluous graphics or no graphics. • Student's presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.
0-34%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no evidence of knowledge base. Little evidence of understanding of discipline. Significant difficulty with theory and problem solving in discipline. • Lacks any critical analysis and/or evaluation. Absence of relevant theoretical content and/or use of theory, where relevant. • Inadequate or no evidence of reading at an academic level with poor application of sources and ideas. Answer is likely to include inappropriate references which are misunderstood and not integrated. Possibility of plagiarism OR no evidence of academic research. Answer may not be research based. • Answer is inadequate with serious flaws in coherence and presentation. Poorly structured with multiple language errors which impact on clarity. No attempt at subject specific vocabulary or inaccurately used. No evidence of academic writing style. Weak application of CU version of Harvard referencing style. • Student uses superfluous graphics or no graphics. Student's presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.