

ASSIGNMENT QUESTION

Programme:	Executive MBA
Module Code & Name:	EMBSC – Strategy and Competition
Business School:	IEMD Graduate Business School, Spain
Course Leader:	
Title:	Independent Research on Tesla

Assignment Tasks:

The company to be examined is Tesla. You will need to carry out independent research.

Part 1

Carry out a full strategic analysis and evaluation of Tesla's current strategic position in the Global Automotive market. Use appendices to provide detailed supporting evidence and make sure that you integrate key points from the appendices into your answers. Your analysis should include as a minimum:

1a.

- The product market mission of the company.
- The basis of competition (Porter's generic and/or Bowman as a minimum).
- Strategic Group Analysis.
- The activities and resources of the company (Value Chain and the Resource Based View).
- The culture of the company (Cultural Web).
- The stakeholders of the company (Stakeholder Analysis: power/interest matrix).

1b.

- An assessment of the relative importance of the performance objectives (cost, quality, speed, dependability and flexibility) for the management of operations at Tesla.
- An evaluation of how supportive Operations are to the overall strategy of Tesla.
- An analysis of how Tesla ensures it can meet its performance objectives (use relevant Operations Management concepts, theories and models).

1c.

- A VRIO analysis of core assets and competencies.
- A comparison with competitors in the same industry (against key performance indicators – you should have this from assignment 1).
- Conclusions (SWOT and conclusions).

Part 2

Using appropriate theory, construct a detailed Stakeholder Analysis for Tesla. In your opinion, does Tesla manage to satisfy all of its stakeholders all of the time? Which are the most powerful groups for the company and why? Could any of these groups pose a threat in the future? Use appendices to provide detailed supporting evidence and make sure that you integrate key **points from the appendices into your answers.**

The word count is 5,000 words (+/- 10%) with indexed headings & subheadings in the following format:

- A Cover Page
- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Body
- Conclusion
- Reference Section

The **Harvard Referencing System** must be adopted with in-text citations.

Further Instructions for Assignment.

1. The general assessment criteria are: Substance, Originality of work, Presentation, Use of illustrations / examples, where appropriate.
2. Independent research on the relevant topics is encouraged.
3. Special consideration would be given to students who demonstrate an in-depth analysis of the questions.
4. Candidates who simply regurgitate their answers from sources may risk getting a poor mark and may risk failing the paper outright if plagiarism is detected.
5. Any similarities between individual assignments will result in a fail grade.
6. The presentation format should be:
 - Top, Bottom margins : 1"
 - Left margins : 1.25"
 - Right margin : 0.8"
 - Header & Footer : 0.5"
 - Printing : Single Page A4 size
 - Vertical spacing : Double
 - Font type & size : Times Roman 12 pt
 - Binding : Comb
 - Page numbering : Page x of y (right justified in footer)
7. Retain a copy of your assignment.
8. You are required to submit a labelled soft copy of your assignment.

Legends for Term Used

Terms	General Description of Work Presented
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relevant issues consistently identified/discussed/analysed to a very high standard with very clear explanations/rationale/justification.• Very strong evidence of wider reading with relevant citations used providing very strong insights into the topic of discussion.• Critical analysis very well developed with strong identifications of pros and cons and the impact/implications of both to the issue at hand.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very professionally and creatively presented quality of work that is very neat and tidy with very coherent flows of arguments.
Good/Strong/Clear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant issues consistently identified/discussed/analysed to a high standard with clear explanations/rationale/justification. • Strong evidence of wider reading with relevant citations used providing strong insights into the topic of discussion. • Critical analysis well developed with good identifications of pros and cons and the impact/implications of both to the issue at hand. • Some professionalism and creativity shown in the quality of presentation with work that is neat and tidy with coherent flows of arguments.
Some / Fair / Somewhat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant issues consistently identified/discussed/analysed to a satisfactory standard with good explanations/rationale/justification. Some inconsistencies. • Some evidence of wider reading with relevant citations used providing good insights into the topic of discussion. • Critical analysis somewhat developed with some identifications of pros and cons and the impact/implications of both to the issue at hand. • Some professionalism and creativity shown in the quality of presentation with work that is somewhat neat and tidy with some coherent flows of arguments.
Poor / Little / Partial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant issues consistently identified/discussed/analysed to an inconsistent standard with poor explanations/rationale/justification. Many inconsistencies detected. • Little evidence of wider reading with relevant citations used providing little insights into the topic of discussion. • Critical analysis poorly developed with little or no identifications of pros and cons and the impact/implications of both to the issue at hand. • Little professionalism and creativity shown in the quality of presentation

	with work that is NOT neat and tidy with incoherent flows of arguments.
--	--