

## Geography 122: Geography, Modernity and Globalization II.

David Brownstein, University of British Columbia

### Corporate Mapping Project.

Learning goals:

- Identify and evaluate relevant information sources.
- Construct and communicate a spatial argument, in both writing and cartographic form.
- Describe the causes and implications of economic, social and environmental spatial variability.

**Topic selection (company) due on Canvas by 6:30pm on Tuesday May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018.**

**Final report and map due in hard copy by 6:30pm on Tuesday June 14<sup>th</sup>. Please also bring an extra copy of your map.**

Pick a unique publicly traded corporation, listed on either the Toronto, New York or NASDAQ Stock exchanges (ie, no two class members can write on the same firm). Visit our Canvas “project” discussion board and claim the firm as taken, by posting a message with the *name, exchange and stock ticker symbol*.

Having identified the company, now prepare an original map (10 marks) and a five-page/1250 word report (15 marks) that communicates the human geography of your chosen firm.

**Your report must be unified by a thoughtful, carefully-constructed argument** that explores why an ethical investor ought to purchase/avoid this stock.

In all cases, your map and report must stress spatial relationships. It must also convey an argument relevant to our over-arching class themes (modernity and globalization). A good argument is something about which you can imagine two people disagreeing. When preparing, assume that I, your sceptical audience, disagree with what you are trying to say.

### The Written report.

When making your argument, pay special attention to the distribution of both power and risk. Your argument ought to be supported by a minimum of **four academic**, peer-reviewed sources and at least **four additional sources** from credible analysts or the popular press. You also need to provide me with a copy of the numerical “data” that you are mapping in an appendix.

All sources must be cited using APA style. You may find more information about the APA citation style right here: <http://wiki.ubc.ca/images/6/6f/Apastyle.pdf>.

Please include your firm’s stock **price chart** for the last 10 years and make meaningful reference to it in your analysis. Indicate your **word count** at the end of the document.

**The Map.**

Your map ought to be on a piece of paper 11x17 inches in size. It can be drawn freehand, imposed upon an otherwise blank world or continental map, or created using the software of your choice. If you have questions about this, then ask. Please do not use Google Maps. Do not simply merge some already existing maps. Do not copy any infographics. I am looking for something that *you* have created.

Your map ought to convey the geographic extent of your firm's network of relationships and activities. This may, but not necessarily, be in the form of a commodity chain or an ecological footprint. While enriched by your written report, the map ought to be able to stand alone and still communicate your argument.

If you absolutely must use software to create your map, then consider visiting the GIS lab in Koerner library <<http://guides.library.ubc.ca/gis/labs>>.

I have scheduled an optional computer mapping workshop to take place on Thursday May 31 from 4 – 6pm.

Understand that regarding computer tools, you are on your own and you won't receive any technical support from me. The great danger with this is that you spend a lot of time trying to learn the software and then don't end up with a map at the end.

**Marking rubric,**

	<b>Sophisticated 80-100</b>	<b>Quite Good 70-79</b>	<b>Sufficient 60-69</b>	<b>Inadequate &lt;60</b>
Company claimed on Connect by May 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 6:30pm? 1 mark	Yes, on time.	Yes, but late or did not include all info.	Yes, but late and needed a reminder.	No.
<b>The Map</b> Argument 5 marks	A clear statement of an <b>Obvious argument.</b>	Neat, but the argument is less than clear.	A murky argument.	Missing an argument. (This may affect other portions of the grade).
Cartographic context 1 mark	Self-contained with cartographic context (title/location, scale, orientation, legend).	Some small contextual elements missing.	Attempt to provide some cartographic context, but significant details are missing.	Not self-contained with little to no context. Cartographic elements entirely missing.
General impression 4 marks	Colourful, creative, consistent, convincing, correct.	Some imperfections mar what is otherwise quite strong work.	Acceptable aesthetic, predictable approach, moderately convincing, possibly contains small errors.	Cluttered, confusing, inconsistent, does not portray any message, propagates incorrect information.
<b>The report</b> Argument 4 marks	<b>Strong argument</b> present, clearly stated at outset, it is logical, well explored and analytical.	An argument is present but not clearly stated, or it may hold unacknowledged assumptions.	Very weak argument, not used to organize the report.	Has no argument, or position is vague, illogical, poorly explored or no analysis.
Core themes 1 mark	Argument relates to core course themes: modernity, globalization.	Gesture towards course themes, but could have stood sharpening.	Argument relates to themes in weak fashion.	No attempt to relate argument to modernity or globalization.
Sources and Data 3 marks	<b>Data in appendix.</b> Sources selected are of strong quality and quantity. Evidence is adequate and accurate, supports claims.	Missing a source, or one source is of poor quality.	Scant data in appendix. Missing a few sources or sources that are weak. Spotty evidence, inaccurate reading of evidence or questionable.	Original data not included in appendix. Insufficient or inappropriate sources. Little to no evidence, mistaken facts, does not support claims.

Analysis 2 marks	Strong analytical skills evident, relevant info drawn from sources, and linked to other info to maximize meaning.	Good analysis, though perhaps missed important points here and there, some links not made explicit.	Simply reporting data from documents rather than contextualizing info in meaningful fashion.	Incorrect analysis or mistakes, mistaken or no contextualization.
Organization 1 mark	High attention to logic and reasoning, leads reader to conclusion and stirs thought. Appropriate length, approx 1250 words.	Coherent and logical with transitions between ideas to create coherence. Perhaps slightly too long or too short.	Some points misplaced and stray from topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout. Too long or too short.	Some coherence but ideas lack unity. Woefully short or shockingly long.
Creativity 1 marks	Independent insight. Original topic covered in sufficient depth, innovative, creative.	Good at synthesizing material but doesn't develop own insights. Topic has novel aspects, average depth.	Mixed topic treatment, unoriginal but acceptable.	Insufficient depth, little to no creativity.
Figures, tables 1 mark	Figures, tables are clear, relevant, and well-integrated.	Figures have minor issues, or not enlisted to illustrate points as they might have been.	Figures present, but possibly unclear, of questionable relevance or not interpreted in your text.	No figures, or irrelevant figures, or not well integrated.
Citations 1 mark	In-text citations deployed properly and bibliography at end	Minor issues in either citations or bibliography.	Significant issues in either citations or bibliography.	Missing citations or bibliography.