



## EXAMINER'S REPORT

MAY 2007

### STAGE 1 PROJECT

#### General Comments

In 2007 projects showed an extremely positive concentration of higher grades in comparison to previous years (As and Bs), with an impressive 66% of candidates in this range. One in three achieving an A grade (33%). 16% of candidates were graded C, 14% graded D and 7% failed. This indeed is a massively encouraging development with respect to an area of investigation which generated an enormous amount of interest and effort. It is always heartening for an examiner to allocate such high marks to a large proportion of those submitting projects.

#### Content Issues

For the sixth year running there are a recurrent set of themes emerging in the weaker or failing projects. A significant number of students showed a clear over-reliance on discussion of the company's background which is only valued at 15% and therefore will never yield a great volume of marks. The second section of the project in most cases was dealt with adequately, although as always it seems a concentration on advertising to the exclusion of the other elements of the marketing mix served candidates poorly. In this year's projects the examiner noticed for the first time a significant focus on pricing and product, but some candidates became carried away with product lines and their technical specifications – not a requirement per se.

As has always been the case in the final section of this project, candidates were required to generate recommendations which could be relevant to other organisations in the same business arena. It is beyond this examiner why some should see this as a section that may or may not be included – it **MUST** be included.

An abstract, word count and bibliography must be included; those projects that do not meet these most basic of requirements will automatically receive a mark of ZERO.

#### Points of Note

- No rational explanation can be given for the appalling lack of attention to referencing and proofreading – other than sheer laziness or carelessness;
- In the case of PLAGIARISM the candidate is deemed to have failed and may not register with the Institute thereafter – not to include in-text references IS considered plagiarism. The Institute has clear referencing guidelines and each candidate must abide by them;
- Even a cursory glance at the detailed and specific brief would indicate electrical retailers such as Peats, DID, PowerCity, B&O, PCWorld Sony etc as a required focus. To develop a project on Hardware, Building supplies or stationary retailers is wholly misguided