

Assignment Remit

Programme Title	BSc. Business Management	
Module Title	Management and Organisation Part 2	
Assignment Title	Teams and Organisational Effectiveness	
Level	BSc	
Weighting	70%	
Module Leader(s)	Peter Foss and Chris Collinge	
Assignment Format	Essay	
Assignment Length	2,000 words	
Submission Format	Online	Individual

Learning Outcomes:

This assignment is designed to assess the following module learning outcomes. Your submission will be marked using the Grading Criteria given in the section below.

- LO1: Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of how organisation theory, approaches and concepts studied underpins management practice
- LO2: Critically appraise the practical applications of these concepts and theories are put to
- LO3: Analyse management practice and popular representations of organisation using relevant approaches and theories from the module

Assignment Description: Individual Assignment (70% of the overall module mark)

Critically evaluate how teamworking along with one other M&O concept can influence the effectiveness of organisations

The literature provides a wide range of discussions around teamwork. The consensus seems to be that when teamworking is managed effectively it can have a positive effect on organisational performance and effectiveness across both task and relationship dimensions. However, if teamworking is not handled well then it could detract from organisational effectiveness. Such recent organisation interventions such as creating a positive employee experience and flexible working have increased employee engagement and satisfaction, which can also influence team performance. The challenge for organisations is how to strengthen the benefits of teamworking while minimising its challenges.



The essay requires that you perform the following activities:

- As a result of your M&O group presentation, briefly and critically reflect on **HOW** your group worked on the task. This is asking you to look at the process of how your group worked, **not WHAT** you did. For example, how did you undertake such activities as communication, motivation, developing a shared understanding, setting up a team culture and inclusion of everyone's perspectives, etc.?
- Use the concept of **teamworking** along with **one additional M&O concept** such as culture, motivation, communication & perception, change, etc. to evaluate how these two concepts could positively influence organizational effectiveness while minimizing its challenges. Do not use the concept of leadership as that will be the topic of a separate module.
- It is your choice which other M&O concept in addition to teamworking that is used in the essay. There are no right or wrong ones, so no need to ask me which one to use.
- For each of the concepts (teamworking and the one additional concept) provide a very **brief example** (no more than three sentences) that will demonstrate and support the evaluation of each concept. You will need to provide one example for each concept.
- Use of examples can be done by way of a short case example, or an example from yourself, a friend or relative who works in an organization, or an example from the media such as a movie that demonstrates the concept. Please **do not** use an example from a well-known organization such as Apple, Google, Amazon, etc. Instead use examples from local Singapore organisations. Each example is to be no more than three normal length sentences. Lengthy examples will have marks deducted.
- In evaluating the two concepts (teams and one other) use relevant literature including both textbooks and peer reviewed journals, avoiding such sources as Wikipedia and consultancy-based websites.
- Ensure that you take a **critical** and not just a descriptive approach to evaluating the literature and aim to use relevant literature and **avoid** using excessive literature or what is sometimes called '**theory dumping**'.

It is recommended that you use the following or a similar structure:

- A) Introduction: Briefly state which additional OB topic in addition to teamworking that you will be discussing (approximately 100 words)
- B) Brief and critical reflection on HOW your group worked in the M&O group presentation (approximately 200 words).
- C) Critical evaluation of the two M&O concepts (teamworking and one other) and their contribution in enabling a positive influence on organisational effectiveness while minimising potential challenges. You could either discuss the two OB concepts separately or together (approximately 1300 words)
- D) In the evaluation include one **brief** organisational example or an example from the media **for each OB topic**. Limit each example to **three sentences maximum**. Examples could be from a personal, family or friend's work experience, case study, literature search, or scanning company websites and other secondary data sources. Please use familiar and local Singapore organisations, and **not** well-known global companies such as Google or Apple.
- E) Provide a brief set of recommendations and **supporting rationale** on how the two M&O concepts could be applied to a local organisation to enable them to strengthen

their organisational performance and effectiveness. Recommendations can be in bullet point format (approximately 200 words)

F) Conclusions:

This is where you draw the evaluation together along with the key themes that were identified (approximately 100 words)

G) Module reflection - Discussion of your primary learning and takeaways from **part 2** of the module (approximately 100 words)

H) References:

Ensure that you use correct Harvard referencing citation style and avoid plagiarism. Suggest between 10-15 different citations, using academic sources. No Wikipedia.

I) Any relevant appendices:

Include any relevant appendices, though avoid using it as a dumping ground for what you may not be able to put into the body of the assignment.

- Format: Use **1.5 spacing** and size 12 font and **provide subheadings** for structure
- Reference related to critical evaluation and avoiding theory dumping:
Mingers, J. (2000). What is it to be critical? Teaching a critical approach to management undergraduates. *Management Learning*, 31(2), 219-237.

Grading Criteria / Marking Rubric

Your submission will be graded according to the following criteria:

1. Response the brief
2. Conceptual themes
3. Analytical fluency
4. Structure, presentation and language
5. Referencing practice

Criteria	Excellent (70%+)	Good (60-69)	Proficient (50-59)	Developing (40-49)	Poor (below 40)
Response to the brief (25%) <i>The extent and proficiency to which the specifics of the assignment task have been attempted and completed.</i>	Provides an exceptionally high-quality response to the specifics of the brief, which is both comprehensive and novel. Instructions have been followed completely.	Provides a complete and effective response to the brief. Task instructions have been accurately followed, albeit with some minor gaps or errors.	Provides a broadly appropriate response to the brief, which delivers the core elements of the task. Some elements are better than others, and there may be some gaps or errors.	Provides a partial response to the brief, with deviation and/or omission from the task instructions. May contain apparent misunderstanding or oversimplification of the required task.	Does not address the brief in any meaningful way. Content provided is not at all relevant, and instructions have not been followed. Suggestion of material misunderstanding of the required task.
Conceptual themes (25%) <i>The extent to which relevant theoretical concepts and practice-based frameworks (e.g., UN SDGs) are</i>	Shows comprehensive understanding of relevant conceptual themes. Demonstrates a very thorough grasp of academic	Conceptual themes are well developed and applied. Shows a detailed and varied understanding of core and related themes. Demonstrates a	Demonstrates a mostly accurate knowledge of core module themes. Draws explicitly on key academic and practice-based ideas. Show an awareness of	Shows some basic awareness of relevant conceptual themes, albeit limited by misunderstanding or gaps in knowledge. Generally descriptive with an	No meaningful engagement with concepts and theory from relevant literature. Similarly, no engagement with relevant practice-based frameworks. Suggestive of

<i>accurately recalled, critically discussed and applied.</i>	and practice-based ideas. Shows attention to detail and a highly developed ability to engage in critical discussion and application.	very good grasp of key academic and practice-based ideas. Shows an ability to engage in critical discussion.	concepts and related literatures introduced within the module. May contain some attempts at critical discussion	apparent absence of critical thinking or application.	material misunderstanding or gaps in knowledge.
Analytical fluency (25%) <i>The extent to which a submission demonstrates a critical and informed examination of a given topic.</i>	An extremely well-developed, coherent analytical argument which systematically draws on conceptual themes. Excellent integration of appropriate contemporary, real-world contexts and relevant theory. Argumentation displays novelty, critique, and balance.	Shows an ability to go beyond description and engage in analytical discussion of a topic. Analytical conclusions are clearly informed by conceptual themes. Argumentation displays levels of critical and evaluative thinking.	Shows an ability to bring together and describe information relevant to a topic. Conclusions have links to conceptual themes, though these may be vague or implicit at times. Thinking appears broadly logical but is not always fully explained or evidenced.	Shows an ability to discuss details relevant to a topic but with little or no explicit connection to specific conceptual themes or empirical support. Discussion is either based on description or unsupported opinion, and the logic may be unclear.	No attempt to integrate conceptual themes into the discussion. Discussion entirely descriptive or based on unsupported assertions. Suggests material issues in terms of balance and/or accuracy.
Structure, presentation and language (15%) <i>The extent to which a submission is clearly and appropriately structured and presented.</i>	Structured and presented in a highly effective way. Displays exceptionally clear thought. Fluency, overall comprehension, and linkages between points are highly extremely well developed.	Consistently tidy, well organised, and in line with task instructions. Uses appropriate formatting (e.g., paragraphs) to structure and present the submission in an effective manner. Consistently good grammar, and comprehension.	Structured and presented in a broadly coherent manner and in line with the key requirements of the task. Occasional issues with formatting (e.g., paragraphs), grammar, and comprehension.	Generally untidy and disorganised, with some areas hard to follow. Issues with formatting (e.g., paragraphs), grammar, and comprehension hinder clarity.	Untidy and disorganised, to the point where it is consistently difficult to follow. Extremely poor presentation. Deviates materially from the instructions provided.
Referencing practice (10%) <i>The accurate and consistent use of correct (Harvard-style) referencing practice.</i>	Near flawless referencing using the Harvard-style method. Conceptual and empirical claims are reliably referenced from high-quality and varied sources.	Extensive and consistent referencing of relevant support. Conceptual and empirical claims are consistently supported. Harvard-style in-text referencing is used accurately and effectively.	A reasonable effort has been made to reference relevant support. Main conceptual and empirical claims are supported. Harvard-style referencing is used, albeit with some formatting errors or omissions.	Generally poor referencing, with significant gaps, formatting errors, and/or weak source usage. Correct referencing conventions have not been followed. Missing either reference list or in-text references.	No meaningful attempt made to reference academic or empirical sources, irrespective of specific conventions. No reference list or in-text references are provided.

Ethical Use of Generative AI (GenAI)

You are permitted to use GenAI to support your submission for this assessment. You may use it for the following activities:

- Researching and refining your ideas
- Information retrieval or background research
- Drafting an outline to organise or summarise your thoughts
- Refining research questions
- Checking spelling and grammar

Applying GenAI tools should be done with human oversight and control. You should carefully review and use the results carefully as AI can generate authoritative-sounding output that can be incorrect, incomplete, uncritical, or biased.

You may not submit any work generated by an AI tool as your own. Where you include any material generated by an AI tool, it should be properly declared just like any other reference material. Alongside your assignment you should also provide a commentary in the Cover Sheet detailing how GenAI has been used to develop your final submission. If you have not used GenAI tools, you should clearly state so.

Further Guidance:

Feedback to Students:

Both Summative and Formative feedback is given to encourage students to reflect on their learning that feed forward into following assessment tasks. The preparation for all assessment tasks will be supported by formative feedback within the tutorials/seminars. Written feedback is provided as appropriate. Please be aware to use a web browser and not the Canvas App as you may not be able to view all comments.

Plagiarism:

It is your responsibility to ensure that you understand correct referencing practices. You are expected to use appropriate references and keep carefully detailed notes of all your information sources, including any material downloaded from the Internet. It is your responsibility to ensure that you are not vulnerable to any alleged breaches of the assessment regulations. More information is available at Xyz Code of Practice on Academic Integrity <https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/as/registry/policy/conduct/plagiarism/index.aspx>.

Wellbeing, Extensions and Extenuating Circumstances:

The processes for extensions and extenuating circumstances (ECs) are to support students who have experienced unforeseen issues that have impacted their ability to engage with their studies and/or complete assessments. Students should notify Wellbeing of any extenuating circumstances as soon as possible via the online form, following the guidance provided. <https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/social-sciences/college-services/wellbeing/index.aspx>





General Marking Rubric: Note that the information below is guidance and feedback only and not a quantitative measure to calculate the grade. The final grade represents the overall quality of the work taking these criteria into account but is the academic judgement of the marker(s).

70% or more	Excellent grasp of knowledge, with evidence of wide reading and/or research analysed in depth to support arguments: - Very good reflection on own behavior and cultural norms, with suggestions about past / future actions, sourced from existing literature (differs from the 60-69 range in terms of applicability of solutions – not the general / obvious ones, but personalized to the author’s situation). - Fully completes tasks set in assignment brief, convincing and consistent argument throughout (points clearly explained and supported by evidence), wide ranging use of and reference to published material. - Exceptional standard of writing and communication, clear structure, no irrelevant material, clear and correct referencing. No errors in spelling and/or grammar.
60-69%	Very good grasp of knowledge, with evidence of wide reading and/or research: - Relevant reflection about past behaviours / future actions, includes some basic solutions to differences (general solutions, applicable in a general work context, inspired by existing literature). - Completes the main tasks set in the assignment brief. Evidence of interpretation and coherent argument involving analysis, synthesis and evaluation. At times however, line of argument is not entirely clear and suffers from inadequate or inconsistent explanation and interrogation; some assumptions about leadership or cultures are made without proper justification. Use of and reference to published material are adequate to support points made. Good standard of writing and structure with clear and largely correct referencing. Occasional spelling and/or grammatical errors.
50-59%	Good grasp of knowledge involved. Evidence of reading and research. - Self-reflection is superficial, interrogates past behaviours in a minimal way, explains own behavior descriptively rather than questioning it, most suggestions are general and obvious, and not sourced from theory. - Completes main tasks set in assignment brief and issues are understood. Provides evidence and reports views on it, but tendency to be quite descriptive and line of argument is not entirely clear, suffering from inadequate or inconsistent explanation. Adequate theory included, referencing generally correct. Occasional spelling and/or grammatical errors.
40-49%	Provides some adequate evidence of reading, research, and self-reflection: - Minimal self-reflection, but still some relevant ideas about leadership included; obvious statements that do not result from analysis, not backed up by theory - Minimal theory used, often limited to the main textbook; confused line of argument and no clear logic. Repeated errors in referencing as well as in spelling and grammar, unaccepted sources used for the theory (.

FAIL <39%	Little evidence of reading and/or research. Little evidence of understanding what is critical analysis in leadership theory. Insufficient or misinterpreted evidence and views. Disorganised. Work presented is irrelevant to the tasks set. Major and many errors in referencing. Frequent spelling and/or grammatical errors.
--------------	---