

# Internal assessment SL, sample D

Assessment criteria	Marks awarded	Marks available
Criterion A	3	4
Criterion B	4	5
Criterion C	4	5
Criterion D	3	3
Criterion E	2	4
Criterion F	2	2
Criterion G	1	2

## Examiner comments

### Criterion A – Supporting documents

The 4 supporting documents are relevant and sufficient in depth. They are from different sources (e.g. one from the Nokia website and two from the Guardian newspaper), however a wider range of views and ideas could have been provided for an even higher mark. It would also be good to have the key passages of the supporting documents used in the commentary highlighted.

### Criterion B – Choice and application of tools, techniques and theories

There is an appropriate selection of business management tools, techniques and theories, especially on marketing (not only using key elements of the marketing mix, such as Promotion, but also using correct subject terminology all along, for example on market analysis). The models are suitably applied (see SWOT in appendix) though minor aspects could be better for an even higher mark (some of the opportunities in the SWOT analysis are internal rather than external).

### Criterion C – Use and analysis of data and integration of ideas

There is an appropriate selection of data from the supporting documents with appropriate analysis. For an even higher mark, a sharper focus on the commentary question (about the strategic alliance) would be necessary (rather than just Nokia itself); the different points made (e.g. about the different Ps) are only partly integrated.

### Criterion D – Conclusions

The conclusions are consistent with the evidence presented and explicitly answer the commentary question about the strategic alliance of Microsoft and Nokia.

### **Criterion E – Evaluation**

There is evidence of evaluation, for example of the strengths and weaknesses of Nokia: however, not all judgments are substantiated. More references to sources, for example through footnotes, would have helped.

### **Criterion F – Structure**

The commentary is well organized and structured; the argumentation flows clearly and logically.

### **Criterion G – Presentation**

Because of several minor flaws (e.g. the page numbers in the table of contents are not correct; the exact source of Supporting Document 1 is not clear; the bibliography does not distinguish between the Supporting Documents and other references; the bibliography should be before the appendices), the commentary can only score 1 (although, at first sight, it seems rather well presented).