

**Coursework 1**

# Assignment 1 (40%): Case Study Response – 2500 words

**Harvard Case Study - Roberto and Carioggia: “Mount Everest – 1996”**

Roberto, M. A., & Carioggia, G. M. (2002). *Mount Everest—1996*. Harvard Business School case study. 303-61.

## Section 1 (60%)

**Take two conceptual areas discussed in class relating to the tragedy on Mount Everest in 1996 (e.g. Cognitive Bias and Psychological Safety) and, using critical discussion, present the two areas: consider the different research that has been done on them and identify areas of agreement, disagreement, ambiguity or contradiction.**

### Introduce theory 1

You should give an explanation and critical discussion of your first chosen area of theory by making consistent and critical scholarly reference to appropriate academic sources. You can use reference to the case as illustrative examples, but avoid using the case to *explain* the theory – your discussion of the research should provide the explanation.

### Introduce theory 2

You should give an explanation and critical discussion of your first chosen area of theory by making consistent and critical scholarly reference to appropriate academic sources. You can use reference to the case as illustrative examples, but avoid using the case to *explain* the theory – your discussion of the research should provide the explanation.

## Section 2 (25%)

**Present how the two conceptual perspectives from section 1 could be integrated in order to better understand the tragedy.**

### Integrate the two theories (the cause of the disaster)

You should discuss how the two chosen areas of theory could be integrated to form a greater understanding of what happened during the disaster on Everest (i.e. your discussions should make it clear that you could not understand the Everest disaster by applying just one area of theory alone). Find points of intersection of the two areas of theory and use literature to support this. You will likely refer back to literature from section 1 here, that is expected, but you should be discussing the way in which these areas may overlap conceptually so as to use them to build a framework for understanding the disaster on Mount Everest.

**[the remaining marks are awarded for scholarly performance**

**and presentation – see marking guide]**

# Submission

## Assignment 1 (40%): Case Study Response – 2500 words

**Assignment 1 is due at 5pm, Thursday of Week 7 (27th February) via electronic submission only**

# Format

Your work should be presented in font size 12, in a legible font (Times New Roman, Ariel, Calibri). You should make use of headings and subheadings to clearly divide the different sections of your work. You are free to make use of further sub-headings as you see fit.

|  |
| --- |
| **Case Study Response Marking Sheet** |
| Name  | **Weak –34%** | **Poor 35% +** | **Satisfactory 40% +** | **Generally Good 50% +** | **Comprehensively good 60% +** | **Excellent 70% +** | **Truly Exceptional 80% +** |
| **Subject Specific Knowledge and Skills** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Content** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identification & discussion of conceptual area 1 – 30% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identification & discussion of conceptual area 2 – 30% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical integration and discussion of two conceptual areas – 25% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation Skills** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academic writing style – 5% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Referencing and List of References – 5% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation – 5% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| ***General Comments*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |