

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Media Studies**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

**Advertising, Marketing and Public Relations Higher**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	7
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	10
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	

### General comments re entry numbers

Numbers remain low.

All of the candidates in the last two years have come from the one centre.

There appears to be a lack of awareness regarding the qualification or reluctance on the part of centres to commit resources to offering it.

### General comments

Some clarification of the instructions in the published extended case study for the course during Session 2001/2 means that direct comparison with the performance of candidates last year is not on a like for like basis.

## **Grade boundaries at C, D and A for each subject area included in the report**

C – 100 marks; B – 120 marks; A – 140 marks; Upper A – 170 marks

### **General commentary on grade boundaries**

#### *Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade*

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries

### **Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area**

No changes made to the normal range of grade boundaries.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

Overall, the standard of work was good and reflected the hard work undertaken by candidates.

The new assessment format was an improvement on previous years and allowed candidates scope to bring together separate strands of advertising, marketing and PR into a cohesive plan. Imaginative and original ideas were strong and relevant to the target market involved.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

The overall marks were divided into three separate sections – planning, developing and evaluating, with the bulk of the marks available in the developing section.

Most candidates gained high marks in the evaluating section where they were able to reflect on their overall plan and to think out possible weaknesses in it.

The imagination shown in the use of sales promotions, advertising campaigns and PR campaigns was usually very good and reflected the strengths required to work in this field.

## **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

Although the assessment format has been improved upon from the previous year, it is acknowledged that the review of the course has to address issues with the project specification. This work has now commenced. Although there were areas where the candidate performance could have been better, it has to be recognised that this was not always the fault of the student.

In particular the developing stage, which was divided into an advertising section and a PR section, was where difficulty was encountered. The candidates appeared to be comfortable with the advertising section but struggled to obtain the relevant information for the PR section.

This is because the work of advertising agencies tends to be more transparent and up-front. They are able to highlight the work that they have produced for clients, the subsequent results they have generated and awards and industry recognition gained along the way. Candidates can identify their work and appreciate the impact it has made amongst them and the target market.

Public relations agencies are only able to talk in general terms about their work, the clients they have and their overall philosophy. Candidates find it harder to judge agencies against these criteria.

## **Areas of common misunderstanding**

Candidates in some cases spent time on issues that were not asked for or where a brief comment would have sufficed.

These included:

Packaging – some candidates went to great lengths to describe the packaging format; whilst this was informative, it should have been downgraded to a paragraph or two.

The Brand Name – many candidates went to great lengths to name the product and to explain the relevance of this brand name; this went on to form a major element of their advertising and PR campaign.

Some candidates were too descriptive when describing the adverts which were to be used in their campaign. A more concise description would have been acceptable or an explanation of the style they were hoping to achieve from the adverts.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

The centre involved in the presentation of candidates for this subject is to be commended for its ability to guide students through the complex issues related to the course.