

Markscheme

November 2023

Business management

Higher level

Paper 1

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2023

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2023

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

The markbands and assessment criteria on pages 3–4 should be used where indicated in the markscheme.

| Section A | | | Level descriptor |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Q1 (b) | Q2 (b) | Q3 (b) | |
| Marks | | | |
| 0 | | | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1–2 | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little knowledge and understanding of relevant issues and business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories. • Little use of business management terminology. • Little reference to the stimulus material. |
| 3–4 | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description or partial analysis of some relevant issues with some use of business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Some reference to the stimulus material that goes beyond the name of a person(s) and/or the name of the organization. • At the lower end of the markband, responses are mainly theoretical. |
| 5–6 | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis of the relevant issues with good use of business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories. • Use of appropriate terminology throughout the response. • Effective use of the stimulus material. |

| Section B Q4 (d) | Level descriptor |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Marks | |
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1–2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little understanding of the demands of the question. • Few business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theory are explained or applied and business management terminology is lacking. • Little reference to the stimulus material. |
| 3–4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some understanding of the demands of the question. • Some relevant business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories are explained or applied, and some appropriate terminology is used. • Some reference to the stimulus material but often not going beyond the name of a person(s) and/or the name of the organization. |
| 5–6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of most of the demands of the question. • Relevant business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories are explained and applied, and appropriate terminology is used most of the time. • Some reference to the stimulus material that goes beyond the name of a person(s) and/or the name of the organization. • Some evidence of a balanced response. • Some judgments are relevant but not substantiated. |
| 7–8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of the demands of the question. • Relevant business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories are explained and applied well, and appropriate terminology is used. • Good reference to the stimulus material. • Good evidence of a balanced response. • The judgments are relevant but not always well substantiated. |
| 9–10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of the demands of the question, including implications, where relevant. • Relevant business management tools (where applicable), techniques and theories are explained clearly and applied purposefully, and appropriate terminology is used throughout the response. • Effective use of the stimulus material in a way that significantly strengthens the response. • Evidence of balance is consistent throughout the response. • The judgments are relevant and well substantiated. |

Section C, question 5

Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding of tools, techniques and theories

This criterion addresses the extent to which the candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of relevant business management tools, techniques and theories, as stated and/or implied by the question. This includes using appropriate business management terminology.

| Marks | Level descriptor |
|-------|---|
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | Superficial knowledge of relevant tools, techniques and theory is demonstrated. |
| 2 | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant tools, techniques and theories is demonstrated. |
| 3 | Good knowledge and understanding of relevant tools, techniques and theories is generally demonstrated, though the explanation may lack some depth or breadth. |
| 4 | Good knowledge and understanding of relevant tools, techniques and theories is demonstrated. |

Criterion B: Application

This criterion addresses the extent to which the candidate is able to apply the relevant business management tools, techniques and theories to the case study organization.

| Marks | Level descriptor |
|-------|--|
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | The relevant business management tools, techniques and theories are connected to the case study organization, but this connection is inappropriate or superficial. |
| 2 | The relevant business management tools, techniques and theories are appropriately connected to the case study organization, but this connection is not developed. |
| 3 | The relevant business management tools, techniques and theories are generally well applied to explain the situation and issues of the case study organization, though the explanation may lack some depth or breadth. Examples are provided. |
| 4 | The relevant business management tools, techniques and theories are well applied to explain the situation and issues of the case study organization. Examples are appropriate and illustrative. |

Criterion C: Reasoned arguments

This criterion assesses the extent to which the candidate makes reasoned arguments. This includes making relevant and balanced arguments by, for example, exploring different practices, weighing up their strengths and weaknesses, comparing and contrasting them or considering their implications, depending on the requirements of the question. It also includes justifying the arguments by presenting evidence for the claims made.

| Marks | Level descriptor |
|-------|--|
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | Statements are made but these are superficial. |
| 2 | Relevant arguments are made but these are mostly unjustified. |
| 3 | Relevant arguments are made and these are mostly justified. |
| 4 | Relevant, balanced arguments are made and these are well justified. |

Criterion D: Structure

This criterion assesses the extent to which the candidate organizes his or her ideas with clarity, and presents a structured piece of writing comprised of:

- an introduction
- a body
- a conclusion
- fit-for-purpose paragraphs.
-

| Marks | Level descriptor |
|--------------|---|
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | Two or fewer of the structural elements are present, and few ideas are clearly organized. |
| 2 | Three of the structural elements are present, or most ideas are clearly organized. |
| 3 | Three or four of the structural elements are present, and most ideas are clearly organized. |
| 4 | All of the structural elements are present, and ideas are clearly organized. |

Criterion E: Individual and societies

This criterion assesses the extent to which the candidate is able to give balanced consideration to the perspectives of a range of relevant stakeholders, including individuals and groups internal and external to the organization.

| Marks | Level descriptor |
|--------------|---|
| 0 | The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below. |
| 1 | One individual or group perspective is considered superficially or inappropriately. |
| 2 | One relevant individual or group perspective is considered appropriately, or two relevant individual or group perspectives are considered superficially or inappropriately. |
| 3 | At least two relevant individual or group perspectives are considered appropriately. |
| 4 | Balanced consideration is given to relevant individual and group perspectives. |

Section A

1. (a) Outline **two** reasons why *BRD* may have chosen external growth rather than internal growth for its expansion (lines 27–28). **[4]**

Reasons for not choosing internal growth are equally as valid as reasons for external growth.

- Convenient way to have **influence over the supply chain**. E.g. Enam Ltd. **BRD wouldn't have the knowledge, expertise** or facilities to easily develop their own paint facilities;
- **extend** their own **product range** into similar products. E.g. Matchfix PLC. Saves BRD the costs of their own Research and Development, buys ready-made production facilities;
- other reasons could include **costs, convenience, speed of growth, synergy** but there is little context for any of these;
- expertise, knowledge of markets, trained/specialized employees at Enam Ltd. or Matchfix PLC. Both companies have “sales across the world”.

Accept any other relevant reason.

N.B. allow reasons that discuss competition. I.e. eliminating competition by taking over Matchfix PLC as a method of external growth. Matchfix PLC and BDR are in the same industry.

Mark as **2+2**.

Award **[1]** for each appropriate reason identified and an additional **[1]** for a description of how each reason relates to *BRD*. Award a maximum of **[2]** for each reason. Award a maximum of **[4]** in total.

N.B. do not accept answers that outline sources of finance as external growth. I.e: “the sale of shares”, “conversion to a public limited company”. This does not answer the question.

- (b) Explain how Arnold’s relationship with *BRD*’s employees may have affected productivity at *BRD* (lines 58–72). **[6]**

There is a great deal of context here to link Arnold with factors affecting morale and motivation. The key is how these factors might relate to productivity.

Positive factors:

- **Personal relationship** he has **with his workers**, remembering birthdays, knowing their family situations, giving a card and small gift on an employee’s birthday, etc.. While these may not have a direct effect on productivity they do seem to have led, through a **sense of belonging** and having a caring employer to a **high level of loyalty, low turnover** and **low absenteeism** which could all have a **positive effect on productivity**. Arnold has a positive leadership style, given his keenness to listen to his staff. This positive relationship may improve productivity.

Mixed/Negative factors:

- **Out of date contracts of employment**, conditions of service. Could demotivate but there’s no evidence. In addition, this factor contrasts with the design team who have perks, health care etc. It could motivate the design teams but demotivate the factory workers. Would this increase motivation for the design team (probably not as self-actualisation might be appropriate to them) more likely to demotivate the factory workers (hygiene factors) and possible loss of productivity? but again, there is no evidence.
- **Team meetings**, could be **time-consuming**, lost time could, possibly, be lost productivity.
- **Difference in treatment** could improve productivity of design teams but reduce productivity of production teams. Possible conflicts between departments.
- His style clearly works, employees have never taken **industrial strike action**, which is **positive impact on productivity**.

Accept any other relevant affect/impact/explanation.

N.B. candidates can solely look at positive **or** negative factors. Balance is not expected for “explain”.

Candidates can assume that Arnold’s leadership style is paternalistic, but the answer must be about “How Arnold’s relationship with BRD’s employees may have affected productivity”.

Marks should be allocated according to the markbands on page 3.

Award a maximum of [3] for a theoretical answer or for limiting answer to only one factor.

Award a maximum of [3] if there is no explicit reference to productivity in the answer.

Award a maximum of [5] if the answer is mainly descriptive but in context.

Award a maximum of [6] for a developed answer in context.

2. (a) Outline **two** ways in which *BRD* could change its marketing mix when it switches to making model trains with plastic rather than metal in 2024 (lines 108–110). **[4]**
- **Product:** will have to reassure potential customers that the **products still look realistic**. May need to address issues related to **durability and quality**. Could outline the product being lighter and maybe more energy efficient in terms of electricity. Customers may have concerns that plastics are not recyclable whereas metals are;
 - **Price:** product is now more like competitors', so BRD is **unlikely** to be able to **charge premium price** as in the past;
 - **Promotion:** BRD is now in a much **more competitive market**. It may have to **increase promotion**, rely less on loyalty, word of mouth;
 - **People:** expertise, training or other considerations applied to the switch;
 - **Process:** sustainable practices;
 - **Physical evidence?** Not much context.

Accept any other relevant way including the 7Ps.

N.B. *the two ways do not need to relate to two different Ps. Answers MUST have explicit reference to the P's of the marketing mix.*

Mark as 2+2.

Award [1] for an appropriate marketing mix P and [1] for a description of how that marketing mix P relates to BRD. Award a maximum of [4] in total.

(b) Explain the likely impact on *BRD* of changing from batch production to cellular manufacturing (lines 41–56).

[6]

Changing a production method would have implications for all the business functions:

- some **employees** may have to be **redeployed, retrained** or even **let go**;
- requires **careful planning** (refining roles and responsibilities);
- may lead to **differing response times**;
- **changes in costs** of production **could change price**;
- could have an **impact on stock control** (affects costs).

Issues related to the two methods:

Batch production:

- having **different types of trains** lends itself to **batch** production;
- however, **coordination is difficult**;
- **absenteeism** suggests **lack of motivation**. Is batch production boring?;
- **affecting productivity**, which is important. **Despatches** being **postponed**.

Cellular manufacturing:

- **loses** two weeks' production, it **won't help productivity** in the short term;
- will **meetings take up productive time**, hence impact on productivity?;
- first step to **automation**: it could be good for productivity but what about employees?;
- separate cells will **empower teams**, it is easier to organize and maybe it will motivate employees;
- possible **resistance to change**?
- should lead to **less wastage** and **lower rejection rates**.

Accept any other reasonable impact/explanation.

Marks should be allocated according to the markbands on page 3.

Award a maximum of [3] for a theoretical answer or for limiting the answer either to batch production or cellular production.

Award a maximum of [5] if the answer is mainly descriptive but in context.

Award a maximum of [6] for a developed answer in context.

3. (a) Outline **two** types of secondary market research that *BRD* could have used to identify the reasons for the decline in sales of model train sets and plastic model kits (lines 114–115). **[4]**
- **Market analysis: competitor** information; but how many train makers are there? Would they cover the same markets?;
 - **Market analysis:** it's a fairly **specialized market** so would **market research reports** be available?;
 - **Market analysis:** BRD's own **sales data** would be helpful. Also, information about their **customers** (needs, wants, age, etc.);
 - **Government publications: statistics** but more likely to be at a **macro level** such as toys, population age, Census data etc.;
 - **Government publications:** may need to look at **separate statistics** from UK, Australia, Canada.

Other sources could include media articles, newspapers, academic journals but there is no context for these.

Accept any other relevant types.

Mark as 2+2.

Award [1] for an appropriate type and [1] for outlining the type of secondary market research with application to BRD. Award a maximum of [4] in total.

- (b) Explain the likely impact on *BRD* of selling additional share capital to solve its liquidity problem (lines 124–141). **[6]**

Additional shares to existing shareholders. They might be more interested in shares for expansion rather than reducing a liquidity crisis. Hence poor take up by existing shareholders.

- **Dilution of ownership** – finished up in hands of 4Change;
- greater **possibility of takeover**. What is 4Change's overall objective?;
- because of lack of initial success may have finished up as a **more expensive option** than other sources of finance;
- **will it solve liquidity problem?** Will the funds generated cover the issues with liquidity?;
- **shares sold at a discount (25%)**. So \$15m rather than \$12m raised but some **loss of control**. Might have been better with a loan.

Accept any other relevant impact/explanation.

Marks should be allocated according to the markbands on page 3.

Award a maximum of [3] for a theoretical answer or for limiting answer to only one impact.

Award a maximum of [5] if the answer is mainly descriptive but in context.

Award a maximum of [6] for a developed answer in context.

Section B

4. (a) Define the term *cost-plus (mark-up) pricing*.

[2]

Adding a fixed mark-up for profit to the unit cost of making a product.

Alternative definition: adding a fixed percentage or a fixed amount to the cost of production.

Alternative definition: **Cost-plus (mark-up) pricing** refers to **adding a mark-up** to the **average unit cost of producing a product**.

[1] cannot be awarded for saying cost-plus pricing is a “mark-up” only.

The definition has to be developed as above. Candidates need to refer to unit/production/full cost for [2].

Beware of circular definitions which cannot be rewarded.

N.B. no application required. Do not credit examples.

Candidates are **not** expected to word their definition **exactly** as above.

Award [1] for a basic definition that conveys partial knowledge and understanding.

Award [2] for a full definition that conveys knowledge and understanding similar to the answer above.

(b) Explain **one** advantage **and one** disadvantage for *BRD* of using just-in-case (JIC) stock control for the manufacture of its model train sets. [4]

Advantages:

- Should **help planning** for **peak sales** in December;
- can **plan for steady production** throughout the year as no need for overtime or hiring additional staff during peak demand periods e.g. Usually in December, train set sales equal three month’s production.

Disadvantages:

- System is not working, **some stock left unsold** e.g. BRD has 300 limited-edition train sets, made in 1999 to mark the Millennium, in stock. Increases stock holding costs;
- **capital is tied up in stocks**;
- **financial implications**, for example the cash-flow problems BRD have experienced in the past;
- **unsold** stock may **decline in value** as no longer seen as relevant BRD has 300 limited-edition train sets, made in 1999 to mark the Millennium, in stock.

Accept any other relevant advantage/disadvantage.

N.B. award [0] if candidates explain the advantages and disadvantages of **just-in-time (JIT)** stock control.

Mark as 2+2.

Award [1] for each advantage and additional [1] for an explanation of how it relates to *BRD*.

Award [1] for each disadvantage and additional [1] for an explanation of how it relates to *BRD*.

[2] can not be awarded per advantage/disadvantage if the response lacks either

explanation and / or application.

For example:

*For an identification or a description of an advantage/disadvantage **with or without** application [1].*

*For explanation of an advantage/disadvantage with **no** application [1].*

*For explanation of an advantage/disadvantage **and** application [2]. Maximum award overall: [4].*

(c) (i) Calculate the difference between the cost for *BRD* to make its own packaging and the cost to buy the packaging from *GXG* (*show all your working*). **[3]**

CTM = 100 000 X £0.55 + £5 000 = £60 000

CTB = 100 000 X £0.56 = £56 000

Difference = £60 000 - £56 000 = **£ 4000**

OR in terms of cost per unit

CTM = £60 000/100 000 = £0.60

CTB = £56 000/100 000 = £0.56

Difference = **£ 0.04**

Alternative method: volume-based pricing

CTM = 100 000 X £0.55 + £5 000 = £60 000

CTB = (75 000 x 0.70) + (15 000 x 0.66) + (10 000 x 0.56)
= 52 500 + 9900 + 5600 = £68 000

Difference = 68 000 – 60 000 = **£8000**

OR in terms of cost per unit

CTM = £60 000/100 000 = £0.60

CTB = £68 000/100 000 = £0.68

Difference = **£ 0.08**

N.B. allow BOD for the use of the \$ or € sign instead of £.

Award [3] for all correct calculations and the correct answer which must include the correct sign (£).

Award [2] for a reasonable attempt with two correct calculations with or without the sign, where the difference is not calculated. Or the correct answer without the correct sign (£).

Award [1] for an attempt to use the data, for example one correct calculation with or without the correct sign (£).

Do not reward formula only.

(ii) Suggest **one** factor, **other than** cost, that *BRD* should consider before deciding whether to make its own packaging or buy packaging from *GXG*. **[1]**

Factors could include:

- **Germany** a long way away – could be **delays**;
- quality – High quality **packaging** is a feature of *BRD* train sets;
- human resource considerations;
- production facilities creating the packaging;
- trust (infers quality);
- **coordination**;
- **exchange rate**;
- political and legal aspects to be considered.

Accept any other relevant factor.

Award [1] for an appropriate and relevant factor related to BRD. No development or context is needed as the question is only worth [1].

(d) Using information from the case study and the additional information above, recommend whether *BRD* should choose **Option 1** (install solar panels) or **Option 2** (outsource production). **[10]**

Option 1:

- Cost £2,572,763, total electricity **savings 75%** per year;
- Business has finance issues – **can it afford capital costs?**;
- **Electricity costs fall** by over £1.2m in first year of operation but only a **small proportion** of overall costs;
- **Electricity costs will increase 10% per annum** so further saving;
- **Environmentally** sound – could be used in marketing;
- Assumes **10% increase** each year – maybe **pessimistic**;
- **Electricity** only accounts for **10 % of variable costs** so impact on overall unit costs **not that significant**;
- **Payback period** is quite **short** – 2 years and 2 months approx. (£1 113 750 + £1 225 125 + £233 888)

Option 2:

- Chinese production. How about **reliability issues? Distance? Delivery issues? Quality?**;
- **no capital costs**;
- impact on **labour relations**, redundancy costs;
- *BRD* train sets will now have to **account for all factory fixed costs** – raises *BRD* train total costs.

N.B. *Candidates may suggest that it doesn't have to be either Option 1 or Option 2.*

Accept any other relevant evaluation.

Marks should be allocated according to the mark bands on page 4 with further guidance below.

Theoretical answer or context limited to naming the business or lack of development max [4].

Discussion of only one option marks limited to [5].

Discussion of Option 1 and 2 with limited reference to the business or no clear balance max [6].

Options considered, good use of evidence, particularly from section B, but no effective conclusion award a maximum of [8].

*For [10] the answer needs to be a fully supported conclusion/evaluation, clearly relevant to *BRD* with good use of context.*

Section C

5. Using the case study and the additional information on pages 5 and 6, recommend whether *BRD* should choose **Option 1** (location and product change) or **Option 2** (repurpose unused factory space).

Strategy 1

Arguments for:

- Highly **valuable** piece of land, **£28 million** release of that value would **open up many opportunities**;
- suitable **factory nearby, reasonable rent, low set up cost**;
- opportunity to **develop a new modern product**;
- **market for unused stock** (India);
- realizes **brand value**;
- keeps head office and design functions local;
- there should be **benefits from outsourcing**;

Arguments against:

- Contrary to what BRD has always done. Big **impact on BRD brand?**;
- **loss of jobs, redundancy** costs, impact on Liverpool;
- **ignores other stakeholders**;
- **is there demand for new product?** What happens to **support for existing products?**;
- it's a bit extreme. Could there be a more moderate, similar development?
- Indian retailer offered £3m to purchase BRD's stocks of train sets valued at £10m (70% off);
- **restraining forces are slightly higher than driving forces (FFA)**, but how reliable are the weights? Have all factors been considered? How about bias?

Strategy 2

Arguments for:

- Could be **synergy** with existing operations;
- with total setup costs of £900 000 and net incomes starting at £350 000 per year for entry there will be a **short payback period**;
- seems a **bigger relative advantage from FFA** but this seems rather a **weak analysis**.
- It might attract younger customers

Arguments against:

- How **reliable is the financial data?** The income from the shop/café seems very high;
- although the **existing business remains, this is a new venture. Lack of experience?**
- Might need highly trained staff

Accept any other relevant discussion.

N.B. *if a candidate responds to this question without any reference to the additional stimulus material (the additional material that comes with question 5 in the examination paper), the maximum mark that the candidate can receive under criteria A, B, C, and E (all the criteria except structure) is [2] per criterion. Award a maximum of [12] overall.*

Marks should be allocated according to the assessment criteria on pages 5–6 with further guidance below.

Criterion A: possible theories, management tools and techniques include: Accounting techniques and ratios, interpreting data, Ansoff, force field, importance of assumptions, also, possibly, Fishbone, Boston Consulting Group matrix, marketing issues, HRM/management issues, SWOT/force field/decision trees (if used with a sense of purpose).

For [4]: Tools, techniques and theory understood and developed well with some relevance to the additional stimulus material.

For [2]: some understanding of at least two tools, techniques or theories, but not developed.

Criterion B: Is about the use of tools, techniques, theories and stimulus applied to the decision. Application will be judged by the use of the stimulus material in particular the extra material.

Remember, understanding has been rewarded in Criterion A. So B is about USE.

For [4]: relevant tools, techniques and theories are applied well to the case study context and additional stimulus material, the application is convincing and relevant.

For [4]: Financial data from page 5 (Tables 3 and / or 4) **plus information** from the force field analysis (Table 5) is used.

No use of financial data from page 5 (Tables 3 and / or 4), **or** information from the force field analysis (Table 5), award a maximum of [3].

If only one option considered, award a maximum of [3].

For [2]: some limited context/application but not developed. Use of tools limits candidate's ability to make reasoned arguments.

Criterion C: Is about the process of making a decision and the strength of the recommendation. Options discussed in a balanced way, conclusions drawn as to whether they work. Remember, 'do nothing' can be a recommendation.

For [4]: There needs to be a clear recommendation supported by the data.

For [2]: Some limited arguments but not justified. Or limited analysis (e.g. one-sided argument) but candidate arrives/draws a reasoned conclusion.

Criterion D: Structure: This criterion assesses the extent to which the candidate organizes his or her ideas with clarity, and presents a structured piece of writing comprised of:

- an introduction
- a concluding paragraph. Please note this can be different from the concept of a conclusion/recommendation in Criterion C. D can be rewarded without a recommendation.
- fit-for-purpose paragraphs. This means: not too long, each focused on distinct issues,
- logical structure. This means whether there is a clear flow to guide the reader through the discussion, how the paragraphs are sequenced.

For [4]: all four elements present, clearly organized.

For [2]: no logical structure but other elements present or logical structure with other elements missing.

Criterion E: Is about the extent to which stakeholders (both groups and individuals) are considered.

- individuals: Arnold Brondy, an Indian retailer,
- groups: The various stakeholders especially board members –Board of directors (4change

and others), employees, customers/visitors.

N.B. to award a mark there must be reference to the stakeholder(s)' **perspective(s)**. Naming the stakeholder(s) is not enough.

For **[4]** individual(s) **and** group(s) perspectives are considered in a balanced way. i.e. needs 1 or more of both individuals' and groups' perspectives developed.

For **[2]**: one individual or one group perspective considered appropriately, or several individuals' and/or groups' perspectives considered superficially.
