Institute of Applied Research & Technology

1	Module Code:	**EAP01AM**
2	Module Name:	**International Business and Global Strategy**
3	Instructors' Name:	**Dr Sevda Ahmadian**
4	Submission Date	**20th December 2026**
5	Late Submission Deadline	**3rd January 2027**

Assignment 2 Research and International Expansion Strategy

1. Purpose and expected standard

Develop the investigation proposed in Assignment 1 into a focused research report for the same named aviation organization, using secondary data, primary data or a justified combination. Use evidence to answer the research questions, compare two country markets, select a target and recommend an entry strategy with a concise marketing and implementation plan.

Demonstrate doctoral-level judgement through critical interpretation, consideration of competing explanations and a defensible conceptual insight. Explain what the findings support, where the framework has limitations and how these affect the recommendation. An entirely new theory or a full dissertation-scale study is not required.

2. Continuity and scope

Retain the organization, core collaboration issue and bounded international setting established in Assignment 1. Explain refinements made in response to feedback and evidence availability. Carry forward its research aim, two to four provisional research questions and conceptual framework; refine these into a coherent, feasible investigation. Do not repeat the full literature review.

Focus on one defined product or service and compare two candidate country markets. If Assignment 1 identified three, briefly justify narrowing the shortlist to two. Integrate the relevant collaboration issue, such as alliances, operations, code sharing, ticketing or shared maintenance repair and overhaul. Depth within a bounded problem takes priority over broad industry coverage.

Students may use secondary data, primary data or a justified combination. Suitable approaches include documentary analysis, interviews, surveys or proportionate quantitative analysis aligned with the research questions. Primary data collection is optional and must comply with applicable institutional ethical approval requirements before recruitment or collection begins. Secondary evidence should support the country comparison where primary data alone cannot provide adequate coverage.

3. Learning outcomes

The report assesses critical company situation analysis and aviation collaboration (LO1); evaluation of market opportunities (LO2); competitive comparison and country selection (LO3); entry strategy and evaluation of effectiveness (LO4); and clear communication of findings and recommendations (LO5).

4. Evidence and analytical approach

Build on the scholarly foundation established in Assignment 1. Update relevant recent research and retain justified foundational works. There is no requirement to identify 10 additional articles or reproduce Assignment 1’s evidence matrix. Explain how the literature informs interpretation and strategic choices.

Distinguish scholarly literature from the primary and/or secondary evidence analysed. Select enough relevant evidence to answer the questions and support a fair comparison; no fixed number of documents is prescribed. Sources may include company reports, regulatory publications, government statistics, aviation datasets and credible industry reports. Appraise corporate claims and corroborate consequential findings with independent evidence where possible.

5. Required report components

5.1. Research focus and framework

State the organizational decision, research aim and two to four aligned questions. Summarize the relevant concepts and relationships from Assignment 1, identifying material refinements. Keep contextual description brief and directly relevant to the investigation.

5.2. Methodology and evidence selection

Justify the approach, unit of analysis, two-country selection and study period. Summarize search and selection procedures, source coverage and analytical steps. For documentary work, explain thematic coding or structured comparison; for quantitative work, define key measures and calculations. Address bias, comparability, missing evidence, ethical use and limits on inference. Place supporting search records and technical details in the appendix.

Where primary data are used, justify participant selection, recruitment, sample adequacy, data collection and analysis procedures. Explain how informed consent, confidentiality and secure data handling were addressed.

5.3. Findings and country selection

Analyze the organization's relevant resources, international readiness and collaboration needs. Compare the two countries using a small set of justified criteria covering demand, competition, regulation, risk and partner opportunities. A compact comparison table is encouraged. Use comparable periods and definitions and distinguish observed evidence from estimates and judgement.

Select the better-supported country and explain the decisive trade-offs. Consider a credible alternative interpretation or changed assumption that could alter the choice. Numerical scoring is optional; if used, explain scales and weights and check the effect of changing a consequential assumption. Extensive modelling is not required.

5.4. Discussion and entry strategy

Answer the research questions by interpreting findings against the framework and literature. Explain one defensible conceptual insight, such as a contextual limitation or a refined relationship, and consider a relevant rival explanation. Distinguish this insight from the practical recommendation.

Compare two feasible entry modes and justify the preferred option. Explain the collaboration arrangement, partner-selection priorities, key responsibilities, governance and a material

contingency. Link the choice to the evidence, regulatory constraints and organizational resources.

5.5. Marketing and implementation

Provide a concise plan covering target segment, positioning, service offering, pricing approach, distribution and promotion. Include a small indicative budget with currency, time horizon and transparent assumptions. Set out phased actions, responsible functions, key risks and mitigation, and two or three measurable performance indicators with review timing and triggers for adjustment. A compact table may combine these elements.

5.6. Conclusion and recommendations

Give direct answers and prioritized actions. State the principal evidence limitation and its consequence for confidence in the strategy. Identify one focused direction for further research.

6. Word limit and supporting records

Submit 2,000–2,500 words, with a maximum of 2,500. Include headings, in-text citations, quotations, footnotes and text in main-body tables or figures. Exclude the title page, reference list and supporting appendices. State the main-text word count on the title page. Institutional rules govern any applicable word-limit penalties.

Use the following allocations as a planning guide for a 2,500-word report. They are indicative rather than separate limits. Components may be integrated where this produces a clearer argument.

Report component	**Indicative words**
Research focus and framework	200
Methodology and evidence selection	350
Findings and country selection	700
Discussion and entry strategy	650
Marketing and implementation	450
Conclusion and recommendations	150
Total	2500

Provide a concise source register recording origin, date, coverage, retrieval details and analytical use. Add one illustrative coding example or a variable dictionary and calculation summary, as appropriate. Where primary data are collected, include the interview guide or questionnaire and relevant ethics documentation; do not append identifiable participant records.

7. Assessment criteria

Marks are out of 100 and contribute 80% of the module mark. Assess reasoning and evidence across the report, regardless of section placement. Depth, coherence and proportionate analysis matter more than the number of frameworks, documents or tables.

Criterion	Marks	Evidence expected
Research focus and methodology	15	Clear continuity from Assignment 1; aligned questions; a justified and transparent design with appropriate limits.
Research evidence and critical appraisal	10	An adequate, traceable dataset or corpus; critical appraisal of bias, comparability and gaps.
Company analysis and country selection	25	Relevant readiness and collaboration analysis; a balanced two-country comparison; justified selection and a proportionate check of uncertainty.
Discussion and entry strategy	25	Answers and conceptual insight grounded in scholarship (10); justified entry-mode comparison and collaboration arrangements (15).
Marketing and implementation	15	Coherent marketing choices; transparent budget assumptions; feasible actions, responsibilities, risks and evaluation measures.
Academic communication and scholarly practice	10	Clear argument and conclusions; appropriate use of literature; accurate Harvard referencing and useful supporting records.
Total	100	

8. Performance descriptors

Apply these descriptors across the weighted criteria. Higher marks within each band reflect stronger depth, precision, independence and coherence within the defined scope and word limit.

Distinction 70 to 100

Rigorous, traceable analysis integrates evidence, evaluates competing explanations and checks consequential assumptions. A clear conceptual insight supports convincing country and entry choices. The implementation plan is feasible, measurable and qualified by evidence limitations. Work at the upper end demonstrates exceptional synthesis, precision and independent judgement.

Merit 60 to 69

A sound design and substantial analysis support coherent strategic choices and meaningful engagement with theory. Source limitations and implementation are addressed, although alternative explanations, assumptions or evaluation measures need deeper examination.

Pass 50 to 59

A broadly appropriate investigation answers the main questions and supports defensible recommendations. Theory integration, source appraisal, comparative reasoning or implementation is uneven or partly descriptive.

Fail below 50

The investigation is incomplete or inadequately supported. Major weaknesses may include an unsuitable design, untraceable evidence, unsupported country or entry choices, limited analysis, or recommendations disconnected from findings.

9. Presentation and submission

Submit an individual academic report as a PDF through the designated Moodle or Turnitin link. The submission deadline is 20 December 2026, and the late submission deadline is 3 January 2027. The module team will confirm the date for returning Assignment 1 feedback. University policy governs extensions and late penalties.

Use numbered headings, Arial or Times New Roman in 12-point type, 1.5 line spacing and 2.5 cm margins. Number pages, tables and figures, and provide descriptive titles and source acknowledgements. Apply Harvard referencing consistently and include a complete reference list.

10. Research integrity

Verify references, calculations, quotations and attributed claims against their sources. Retain the source register, working data and analytical records. Distinguish observed evidence, interpretations, assumptions and proposed actions. Label budget estimates and proposed performance targets clearly; do not present them as verified results.

Do not fabricate data, participants, quotations or research activities. Respect data licenses and any confidentiality restrictions. Explain how Assignment 1 has been developed and acknowledge reused material in accordance with institutional requirements.

Any permitted generative AI use must comply with current University policy and be disclosed as required. The student remains responsible for research design, source accuracy, analysis and scholarly judgement.