



EXAMINER'S REPORT

MAY 2001

MARKETING INFORMATION ANALYSIS II (MIA 2)

General Comments

Most candidates displayed adequate, in some cases outstanding, preparation for this examination. Results however, showed the expected range of attainment with approximately one quarter of candidates failing to attain a D grade or better, while about the same proportion achieved a B grade or better (i.e., an A or B grade). While there was the usual discrepancy in performance between Sections A and B of the paper in favour of Section A, this pattern was not as pronounced on this occasion as in recent years.

SECTION A

Question 1

Candidates have come to expect a question of this sort and most are quite well prepared to deal with it. A weakness in answers was a tendency to make general points in part (b) rather than follow through a particular example as requested. Some candidates clearly find it difficult to distinguish the distinctive processes involved in (i) problem definition (ii) the research process (iii) research design

Question 2

An optimum classification of computerised data bases would be that outlined in the essential text. However, other schemes were acceptable. Some candidates included detailed accounts of syndicated data sources which would have to be regarded as surplus, if not irrelevant, to the question asked. Almost everybody seems to know the functions loyalty cards serve for marketers.

Question 3

People often found it difficult to define/explain measurement and scaling adequately. The safest bet with quite subtle concepts of this sort is to learn the textbook definition or some equivalent. An error in the examination paper in part (b) of this question, the inappropriate insertion of the word "the", while it changed the sense of the question, did not seem to disturb candidates, as the context probably indicated that what was required were examples relevant to marketing of each of the four primary scales. In the very few cases where it may have seemed that the candidate interpreted the question to mean how one would market such scales, credit was allowed by the examiner.

Question 4

Causal relationships in marketing may be seen as part of the general issue of research design. To that extent, this question could be accommodated within Section A of the paper. In recent years questions on experimental design and related issues relevant to causal research have appeared in Section B of the paper. On this occasion it appeared in Section A, which the Examiner bore in mind when marking the paper. In future it will appear in Section B. As always when specific questions are asked, as in part (b), which require particular/technical information, only candidates with a good understanding of the relevant material can produce a quality answer.

SECTION B**Question 5**

In general, the standard of answers to this question was relatively high. Even candidates who demonstrate a reluctance to tackle other topics of a quantitative character seem happy with sampling questions.

Question 6

Where this question was attempted the standard of answer tended to be good. The question was sufficiently general in respect of allowing varying types of examples of statistical analysis, to allow candidates to show their understanding of the general character of hypothesis testing.

Question 7

Candidates who attempted this question were generally able to answer part (a) but few were capable of dealing adequately with part (b). Some candidates are still inclined to think that there is some connection between cluster analysis and cluster sampling because of the similarity in name.

Question 8

Few candidates attempted this question. Its inclusion reflects the principle that marketing graduates should be capable of interpreting the key output from commonly used statistical tests, such as chi-square, t tests and analysis of variance. The wide availability of “statistical packages”, such as SPSS, seems to entail that such a capability would be a requirement of students who have completed a course in information analysis.