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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit Title: Business in Emerging Markets |  |
|  |  |  | Level: 6 |
| Assignment Title: Coursework |
| Individual Essay  |
| Unit Learning Outcomes Assessed. State what **Unit** Learning Outcomes are being covered by the assessment1. Identify and evaluate the key influences both internal and external, which have shaped the economic and business environments of key emerging markets.

4. Apply appropriate tools of analysis to conduct research in selected markets. |
| Assignment Details and Instructions. This is an individual piece of work and accounts for 50% of the overall unit mark.. |
| Yeah Early Career/ World Class Professional Skills (PLOs) being assessed or developed/assessed. PLO 2.1.1 - Work is appropriately structured, logical and organisedPLO 2.1.2 - Appropriate language, grammar, syntax and spelling is used PLO 2.1.3 - Consistent and appropriate referencing and in text citation is used PLO 4.1.1 - Identify professional and commercial issues PLO 4.1.2 - Explain professional and commercial issues PLO 4.1.3 - Critique professional and commercial issues PLO 4.2.1 - Identify and explain global context PLO 4.2.2 - Critically discuss the global context |

|  |
| --- |
| ResourcesKey reading on moodle: Hodgson, G. (2006). What Are Institutions? Journal of Economic Issues, 40(1), 1-25.Acemoglu, D., & Johnson, S. (2005). Unbundling Institutions. Journal of Political Economy, 113(5), 949-995. doi:10.1086/432166Acemoglu, D., Robinson. J,. (2010) Why is Africa Poor?, Economic History of Developing Regions, 25:1, 21-50,Acemoglu, D., S. Johnson, and J. A. Robinson (2005), ‘Institutions as the Fundamental Cause of Long-Run Growth’, in P. Aghion and S. Durlauf (eds.), Handbook of Economic Growth, Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 385–472.Birdsall, N (2007). “Do No Harm: Aid, Weak Institutions and the Missing Middle in Africa,” Development Policy Review, Overseas Development Institute, vol. 25(5), pages 575-598, September |
| Marking Criteria Assessment Marking Criteria Rubric- This is how your work will be graded. You will receive an overall grade that will be GUIDED by each of the criteria. The mark will fall into a 2, 5, or 8 range such as 62, 65, 68. This grade may be achieved by the demonstration of strengths in different areas.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment descriptor | 0-19% | 20-29% | 30-39% | 40-49% | 50-59% | 60-69% | 70-85% | 86-100 |
| **1: Extent to which the essay has contextualised the growth and development experience of China and Sub Saharan Africa using appropriate indicators.** | Absent/none, lacking, | Erroneous/wrong, missing, extremely limited, inappropriate, insufficient, incoherent, unstructured | Incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent, derivative, contradictory, superficial, irrelevant, limited | Satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive, | Clear, confident, consistent, thoughtful, accurate, careful, congruent, coherent | Fluent, thorough, analytical, precise, rigorous | Persuasive, sophisticated, original, reflective, ambitious, meticulous, critical, convincing, unexpected | Creative, insightful, illuminating, inspiring, exciting, authoritative |
| **2: Extent to which the essay has explained institutional theory in the context of growth and development** | Absent/none, lacking, | Erroneous/wrong, missing, extremely limited, inappropriate, insufficient, incoherent, unstructured | Incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent, derivative, contradictory, superficial, irrelevant, limited | Satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive, | Clear, confident, consistent, thoughtful, accurate, careful, congruent, coherent | Fluent, thorough, analytical, precise, rigorous | Persuasive, sophisticated, original, reflective, ambitious, meticulous, critical, convincing, unexpected | Creative, insightful, illuminating, inspiring, exciting, authoritative |
| **3: Extent to which the essay has applied theory, with evidence, to the regions in question.** | Absent/none, lacking, | Erroneous/wrong, missing, extremely limited, inappropriate, insufficient, incoherent, unstructured | Incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent, derivative, contradictory, superficial, irrelevant, limited | Satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive, | Clear, confident, consistent, thoughtful, accurate, careful, congruent, coherent | Fluent, thorough, analytical, precise, rigorous | Persuasive, sophisticated, original, reflective, ambitious, meticulous, critical, convincing, unexpected | Creative, insightful, illuminating, inspiring, exciting, authoritative |
| **4: Extent to which the essay has drawn conclusions from the analysis that are coherent and logical.** | Absent/none, lacking, | Erroneous/wrong, missing, extremely limited, inappropriate, insufficient, incoherent, unstructured | Incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent, derivative, contradictory, superficial, irrelevant, limited | Satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive, | Clear, confident, consistent, thoughtful, accurate, careful, congruent, coherent | Fluent, thorough, analytical, precise, rigorous | Persuasive, sophisticated, original, reflective, ambitious, meticulous, critical, convincing, unexpected | Creative, insightful, illuminating, inspiring, exciting, authoritative |
| **5: Essay is well structured, logical and organised** | Unstructured, illogical flow, disorganised | Poor structure disrupted flow. Limited logical flow | Some structure and logical flow, but still too jumbled | Adequate structure and flow, acceptable organisation | Satisfactory structure and organisation. Coherent and logical flow | Good structure and organisation. Critical flow and connectivity between elements  | Excellent structure and organisation. Fluent and precise connectivity between elements | Outstanding structure and organisation. Authoritative connectivity between elements  |
| **6: Appropriate academic language, spelling, grammar syntax**  | Inappropriate language and syntax unacceptable grammar and spelling | Very poor usage of language, syntax and spelling; extremely poor grammar | Poor use of academic language, too many spelling errors, bad grammar | Acceptable, language, grammar and syntax. Still needs to be more academic | Satisfactory use of academic language. Appropriate syntax, few spelling or grammatical errors | Good use of academic language. Precise syntax. No grammatical or spelling errors | Excellent use of academic language, sophisticated syntax. Excellent spelling and grammar | Complex language and syntax. Outstanding grammar |
| **7: Consistent and appropriate referencing and in text citation** | No referencing apparent  | Very few references, inappropriate sources, poor in text citation. Poor use of Harvard style | Some references and in text citation.Not in the Harvard style or inconsistently applied | Adequate Harvard referencing, but still some inconsistences, some inappropriate sources. Adequate in text citations | Satisfactory Harvard referencing, Sufficient in text citations, more needed. | Thorough and sufficient referencing. Precise in text citations | Sophisticated referencing and in text citations | Authoritative referencing and in text citations |

  |
| Ŷ |