Assignment 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Marks out of** | **Wtg(%)** | **Due date** |
| Assignment 2 | 100 | 50% |  |

Format for assignment 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task:** | *A 2,000 word written assignment. You are required to analyse the issue in the following case study on Dayglo Devices Inc. and provide a memorandum of advice to the Executive Director, International**Operations.*  |
| **Relevant Modules:** | *You need to use your learning from Modules 2, 3, 4 and 5.* |
| **Instructions:** | *Further details about your task for this assignment appear after the case study.**Please submit your assignment to USQ via your Education Officer.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assignment 2 Case Study: Dayglo Devices Inc.****Quick Reference:****Dayglo Devices Inc.:** A multi-national toy manufacturer and distributor**Hillary Rodham**: Executive Director, International Operations**David Cochrane**: Executive Manager, Marketing - who has just resigned**Leigh Enfield**: Marketing Manager (Australian Division) - potential replacement for David At 7:30 am, Hillary Rodham hit the snooze alarm for the third time, but she knew she could not go back to sleep. Rubbing her eyes and shaking off a headache, Hillary first checked her phone and read an urgent message from her boss, explaining that David Cochrane, Executive Manager, Marketing, had resigned this morning and needed to be replaced immediately. Frustrated, Hillary lumbered into the shower, hoping it would energise her to face another day. After last night’s management meeting, which had ended after midnight, she was reeling from the news that her employer, Dayglo Devices, was spiralling toward a financial meltdown.Hillary scratched her head and wondered, ‘How could one of the world’s largest toy manufacturers plummet from being a gold standard in the industry to one struggling for survival?’ At the end of 2018, Dayglo Devices Inc. had $5 billion in annual revenue, and sold its products throughout 150 nations in the World and employed 20,000 people in offices and facilities located in 25 countries. After five years of falling sales, stemming from rapid shifts towards digital-based toys, Dayglo was facing yet again, another year of declining revenues and falling profit. At her office, Hillary and her co-workers felt growing pressure to respond to this crisis quickly and ethically. But morale was sagging and decision making was stalled. New projects were on hold, revenues weren’t coming in fast enough, and job cuts were imminent. Finger-pointing and resignations of key managers had become commonplace. Strong management was needed to guide employees to stay the course. Hillary knew her priority was to replace David Cochrane. When leaving the meeting the previous night, Hillary’s boss had told her, ‘It’s critical that we keep key managers in place as we weather this storm. If we lose any, be sure you replace them with ones who can handle the stress and can make tough, maybe even unpopular decisions.Working up a sweat as Hillary rushed into her office, she began sorting through the day’s priorities. Her first task would be to consider internal candidates to replace David Cochrane. She pondered the characteristics required of a chief marketing manager and scribbled them on a notepad: experienced in marketing and branding issues; strong decision-making skills; high ethical standards; able to make job cuts; comfortable slashing budgets; and respected for calm leadership. Hillary immediately thought of Leigh Enfield, a marketing manager in Dayglo’s Australian division who had been vocal about her desire to move up the corporate ladder and had recently shown steady leadership as the organisation started to crumble.Leigh had worked her way up through the organisation, becoming a respected expert in her field. She had developed a strong team of loyal employees and made training and job development a priority. She was likable, sensitive to her employees, and a consensus builder. While some managers within Dayglo Devices had made questionable business decisions, Leigh had held herself to a high ethical standard and created a culture of integrity within her marketing branch. Leigh was focused on the future – a go-getter who knew how to get results.With the future of the company at stake, however, Hillary wondered if Leigh could handle the tough challenges ahead. Although Hillary valued Leigh’s team-building skills, Hillary also knew that Leigh could be soft when it came to holding employees accountable. A large part of Leigh’s motivation was to have people like her. At the last company meeting, when she reported a shortfall in responses to a consumer campaign lead by her division and came under fire, she had become defensive and didn’t want to point fingers at employees who were to blame. In fact, Hillary recalled another instance when Leigh recoiled at the thought of having a stern conversation with an employee who had developed a pattern of poor attendance (reportedly the employee was caring for her sick husband). She confessed a hesitation to confront under-performers and employees struggling to balance home and work life.Hillary stirred her morning coffee and pondered, ‘Is Leigh Enfield capable of balancing kindness and toughness during an organisational crises? I know she is creative and innovative with her marketing campaigns, and she is great at spearheading major campaigns, but can I count on her to be decisive and focused on top- and bottom-line results? Is she too much of a people pleaser? Will it impact her ability to manage successfully?’ Hillary picked up the phone and dialled YOU because Hillary remembered that you are studying management at University. You answered the phone, and after explaining her situation, Hillary asks you: ‘**Is it possible for a manager who demonstrates kindness and concern for employees to also achieve productive outcomes for Dayglo Devices Inc., particularly in light of the organisation’s current issues and environment?**’ Rather than conjure up a verbal response for Hillary on the spot, you advised her that you will provide her with some considered, written advice. This case is an adapted version of the case, ‘Studer International’ in Daft, RL, 2011, The Leadership Experience, 5th edn, South-Western Cengage, pp. 30-31. |

Your task for this assignment

Write a 2000 word response providing advice to Hillary in relation to her question.

1. Make sure you tailor your advice as much as possible to take into account Leigh’s strengths and weaknesses and the organisational situation.
2. Dedicate some of your word count (approx. 100 words) to making a justified, summary recommendation to Hillary as to the way forward with the filling of the vacancy, justifying why this way forward would be an appropriate course of action (remember the elements of a reasoned argument in the critical thinking competency: element grounds-warrant-claim).
3. You are expected to use, as a theoretical basis for your advice, the competing values framework (CVF) and draw upon appropriately selected content from each of Modules 2, 3, 4 and 5 in relation to the competencies (you are not expected to address all the competencies in the model, just one or two key ones from each quadrant that you think have most relevance and that will help you support your argument to Hillary). Module 1 may also provide useful contextual information.

Additional instructions

1. **You MUST use the Memorandum (memo) template available on the StudyDesk for your assignment**. This template contains the marking criteria sheet upfront for the evaluator to complete. You write your assignment in the template. You do not need to generate a separate coversheet for this assignment.
2. A copy of the marking criteria sheet accompanies the memo template on the StudyDesk. Please review it.
3. You are writing your advice in the form of an office memo. As a guide you should include a brief introduction and a summary conclusion of your advice. **Treat this assignment as you would if you were writing to an executive manager of a multi-national corporation.**
4. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Referencing *is essential*, even though it is a memorandum. We have not prescribed a minimum number of additional references. This is for your discretion, however, bear in mind the references you use will be an indication of your wider reading and assimilation of ideas. If it helps, a general guide seems to be a *minimum* of five (5) quality references for a 2000 word essay *in addition to* referencing the textbook and module readings provided to you in MGT2002.
5. Assignments heavily over the combined, total word count can be marked up to a point of the evaluator’s assessment of ten percent over the set word limits. An excessive word count provides the student with an unfair advantage, and it places an unreasonable demand on the evaluator’s time allocation per student.
6. Use Harvard AGPS referencing conventions. There is a link to the USQ Library ‘Harvard AGPS Reference Guide on the StudyDesk in the **Getting started, General study resources** block.
7. Presentation requirements:

A. Present your answers using 1.5 line spacing, Times Roman 12 point font (the template is already set to these requirements).

B. Page numbers, headers and footers have been included in the template. You need to insert your student details into the header.

C. Headings, diagrams and/or brief tables are permissible in your responses. Tables and diagrams (if used) must be labelled and referenced and must be explained in the body of your answer. If you have solely developed it, cite it as ‘Developed for assignment’. If you adapt someone else’s work, cite this in a similar fashion to the acknowledgement at the end of the assignment case study above (adapted from: author, year page no. similar to the acknowledgement provided after the case study for this assignment.).

D. Compile a List of References on the last page of the assignment (as allowed for in the assignment template) according to Harvard AGPS requirements.

**m e m o r a n d u m**

**TO:**

**FROM:**

**SUBJECT:**

**DATE:**

Type your 2,000 word response from here…

**Summary recommendation:**

Dedicate some of your word count (approx. 100 words) to making a justified, summary recommendation to Maya as to the way forward with the filling of the vacancy, justifying why this way forward would be an appropriate course of action (remember the elements of a reasoned argument in the critical thinking competency: element grounds-warrant-claim).

**Make sure you delete these sentences before you submit your assignment**. Make sure also that you type your answer in 1.5 line spacing and justified - just as they appear in this sample of writing. Also, you can delete the ‘Header’ from your Memo before submission to your Education officer.

***Tips about the word count***: You have a limit of 2,000 words (excluding the **summary recommendation** and **list of references**). Your full word count showing on the screen will be around 2,500 + list of references, to take into account the marking sheet.

**List of References**

Insert a list of references on this page. Make sure you **delete** these sentences before you submit your assignment:

Remember to list your entries in alphabetical order according to the author of the article or if the author is not known, the organisation responsible for the publication.

Make sure you use Harvard AGPS style throughout your answer and in your list of references.

**Note**: These sentences are presented single line space, unjustified, with a single line between each one. This is how you present your entries in the list of references.

**This page is for the Evaluator’s Use Only**

**MGT2002 Perspectives of Organisation: Assignment 2 marking sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **F** | **C** | **B** | **A** | **HD** |
| Accuracy of: 1. Interpretation of assignment task
2. Theory / topic selection and explanation
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inadequate interpretation of theory and task or misconception of the theory and task. Irrelevant theory used or atheoretical. | Rudimentary understanding of the task. Theory selected and presented accurately in the main but missed vital detail. Minor misidentification of theories may occur.  | Sufficient understanding and interpretation of tasks. Theory well selected & explained but missed detail or inaccuracy may have occurred at points. | Very good understanding and interpretation of the task and theory. Theory choice well selected and accurately presented. | Unequivocal understanding and interpretation of task and theory. Theory choice well selected, concisely and accurately presented. |
| Quality of application of theory  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited and no application. Incorrect or poor application of theories. Heavily atheoretical. | Occasions of atheoretical writing. Loose/ marginal application of theories. | Application of ideas to material is sound but suggests conceptual gaps or misunderstanding. | Clear and appropriate application of theories. | Accurate and thorough but concise application of theories |
| Critical analysis:1.Quality of the reasoned argument to support the overall ‘claim’ being made2. quality of and use of additional sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No evidence of critical analysis. Insufficient research/very limited sources. Sources used but in many cases not scholarly, inappropriate, irrelevant or misaligned to the issue being discussed  | Response relies on restating major themes from sources; little evidence of critical analysis. / Limited research on the relevant themes/ additional sources obtained but not always scholarly / Relevance of sources often implicit.  | Some evidence of critical analysisSufficient research is displayed on relevant themes / additional sources of scholarly quality but relevance can be better explained at times. | Critical analysis of sources/ critical appraisal of evidence and sources. Thorough research on the topic/ additional scholarly sources with each one’s relevance apparent and explained well and value-add in the majority of cases. | Highly developed critical analysis and assessment of sources. Displays broad and in-depth research of the topic/ additional scholarly sources that are clearly relevant, value-add and are always explained. |
| **Marks for Content /60**  |  |
| Presentation & professionalismWritten expressionStructureHarvard AGPS referencing protocol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Could not be presented in the workplace. /Lacks a discernible progression of points to support argument. Paragraph topics are unclear. / Paragraphs are generally fragmentary or overly long. Many errors in grammar / written expression is difficult to follow. / well over the required length.Referencing is nearly/entirely absent. | Editing required to bring to a workplace standard. / A discernable relationship between points, but lacks detailed structure and/or coherence. / Paragraphs show some arrangement into related ideas but the topic is implicit. / Regular grammatical errors impaired the clarity of expression. / May be over word count. / Referencing inconsistent with errors | Acceptable workplace standard / Demonstrates planning in sequencing of paragraphs, but not all are clearly linked.Contains some overly long or short paragraphs. Some grammatical errors. Required length. Referencing is broadly compliant, with some errors or inconsistency in style. | Professional standard/ Uses paragraphs to order argument effectively. / Demonstrates controlled progression of argument through paragraph structure / Contains minor grammatical errors Demonstrates generally clear written expression. Required length. / Referencing is compliant, with very minor errors. | Professional standard that you would be proud to present at work / Uses paragraphs to order evidence and argument effectively. / Demonstrates a logical progression of paragraphs to support argument. Entirely free of grammatical errors. / Shows clarity of expression. / Required length. /Referencing is fully compliant  |
| **Marks for the writing process /40** |  |
| **TOTAL MARKS / 100**  |  |
| **GRADES** | **F: < 50** | **C: 50-64** | **B: 65-74**  | **A: 75-84** | **HD: 85+** |
| **Evaluator’s comments** :  |