

## **SENIOR EXAMINER'S REPORT FOR STUDENTS AND TUTORS OF CIMG**

**MODULE NAME:**     MARKETING RESEARCH AND INSIGHTS

**AWARD NAME:**     PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMA IN MARKETING

**DATE:**             DECEMBER 2021

### **1.0 OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER**

Discuss the overall pass rate.

Discuss the principles that differentiate a pass-candidate from a failed candidate.

Discuss the overall pillars of the subject and the paper.

This will guide the user to understand the rationale behind the range of questions selected by the Examiner.

### **2.0 PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS**

#### **[General Strengths and Weaknesses of Candidates]**

- The mandatory question was modelled on a popular question type from CIM(UK) past questions and there is a general sense that most candidates had prepared for it. However, this did not translate into all round good performance on questions 1A and 1B. To obtain a high grade for Q1A candidates were required to give some context regarding why the extra information requested for was necessary for a good proposal to be done. Most candidates did not do this.

## 2.0 QUESTIONS PERFORMANCE

Q/N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6
Average Score						
Highest Score						
Lowest Score						

## 3.0 STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESS BY QUESTION GENERAL REMARKS

**[Which questions was popular and attempted by candidates? Show of Behaviourial, Technical and Core Job competencies]**

- Q5 was popular; it relates to core job competencies. Candidates demonstrated an understanding of the requirements under the question.

## QUESTION 1A

- This was a mandatory question and was attempted by both. Candidates showed some anticipation of the question. However, they did not demonstrate strong practical knowledge and understanding of marketing research projects required as a core job competency.
- The mandatory question was modelled on a popular question type from CIM(UK) past questions and there is a general sense that most candidates had prepared for it. However, this did not translate into all round good performance on questions 1A and 1B. To obtain a high grade for Q1A candidates were required to give some context regarding why the extra information requested for was necessary for a good proposal to be done. Most candidates did not do this.

### **QUESTION 1B**

- This question tested technical and job competencies. Majority of candidates showed a preparedness for the type of question and the broader requirement of the format for a proposal. However, they demonstrated weak ability in responding to the specific case study and requirements.
- On Q1B a key challenge was candidates' inability to define - and explain the practical implications of undertaking - a 'market sizing' study. As a result, relevant methodology, including appropriate sampling strategy, was not proposed. Most candidates did not also touch on the approach to data analyses and standard analytical frameworks required in market sizing studies specifically and marketing research generally.

### **QUESTION 1C**

- NOT APPLICABLE

### **QUESTION 2**

- This question tested technical knowledge. It however emerged as the most difficult question with the few who attempted it not being able to deal with it thoroughly. The few who attempted it did not show the link between the sampling approach mentioned and why it was more or less costly in a relative sense.

### **QUESTION 3**

- The question was a test of technical knowledge relating to close-ended questions and what constitutes consumer behaviour and psychography. Most candidates did well on providing closed-ended questions for behaviour. There was a sense, however, that candidates were not familiar with the phrase 'consumer psychography' and this affected their response to the second question.

#### QUESTION 4

- The question was a test of both job competency and technical knowledge of qualitative research in general and focus group discussions specifically. Candidates demonstrated familiarity with the question type and its expectations, and this reflected in the structure of their answers. However, in many cases, actual answers provided lacked technical depth and relevant, appreciable scope.

#### QUESTION 5

- Although this question was popular, candidates did not demonstrate the base understanding behind the question. Neither did they show a clear linkage between the requirements of the question (which tests job competencies) with related technical knowledge of the area i.e. how and why quality assurance is required to deal with the research issues of validity and reliability

#### QUESTION 6

- N/A

#### 1.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- For subsequent examinations examiners may need to engage lecturers and students on areas that are likely to be examined. Local texts must also help address the gaps mentioned.

Senior Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ ISAAC GWUMAH \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ 25<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2022  
PRINT NAME