



## **EXAMINER'S REPORT**

**MAY 2005**

### **STAGE 2 PROJECT**

In general the submissions received for this year's Stage 2 Project were of a satisfactory standard with a high pass rate and a significant number of Projects obtaining an A or B Grade.

Students who failed to meet the basic requirements of the project brief, generally were unsuccessful. This required an environmental analysis and an examination of the competitors in a marketplace, and to use appropriate primary research techniques to investigate buyer behaviour. This latter component was to be a significant element of the exercise.

The brief necessitated students to examine the marketing environment of a company involved in the Hospitality industry and to investigate the effects of the Smoking Ban. Projects were rewarded where the information gathered was evaluated and analysed. In many cases students used appropriate models and frameworks (such as SWOT, PEST, Five Forces) to undertake this examination. Some students provided a very comprehensive, detailed and focussed examination.

Plagiarism continued to be a significant problem where students failed to acknowledge sources of information. Adequate and detailed referencing with a bibliography is expected. In a lot of instances claims and assertions were made without providing any supporting evidence whatsoever.

Students were asked to detail how their primary research was designed and implemented. Some students failed to consider, or did not understand, the research design choices they made. Most students undertook some form of survey research; others used focus groups and depth interviews, while a few employed observation. Where survey questionnaires were used students were expected to demonstrate good design principles. There was also an extreme variation in how the primary research data was presented and analysed. Better submissions provided a detailed analysis, using graphical representation where appropriate and the key findings were highlighted and related to the initial objectives of the study.

The project also required students to speculate on possible future developments and make recommendations for the selected company. The better submissions based this speculation on the previous analyses and invested considerable effort in developing various scenarios and promising responses.

Better projects were logically structured, presenting their arguments in a coherent fashion. The document had been adequately proof read and simple grammatical and spelling errors had been removed. Only essential material was included in the main body of the report with other information submitted as appendices.