

Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International Advanced Level

BUSINESS 9609/31

Paper 3 Case Study

October/November 2017

MARK SCHEME
Maximum Mark: 100

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

 ${\rm \rlap{R}\hskip-1pt B}$ IGCSE is a registered trademark.



| Question | Answer | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|----|--|--|--|
| 1 | Analyse | e the possible disadva | ntages for KKS of taki | ng over VantoU. | 10 | | | |
| | Level | Knowledge 3 marks | Application 2 marks | Analysis 5 marks | | | | |
| | 2 | 3 marks Two or more relevant points made about disadvantages | 2 marks Points made are applied to KKS | 3–5 marks Good use of theory to explain disadvantages of merging | | | | |
| | 1 | 1-2 marks One or two relevant points made about disadvantages | 1 mark Some application to KKS | 1–2 marks Some use of theory to explain disadvantages of merging | | | | |
| | 0 | | No creditable content | | | | | |
| | Note to examiners: do not reward possible advantages or credit reproduction of phrases in the case study without expansion/comment. Answers could include: Disadvantages of merging Possibility of government investigating greater market power (unlikely) | | | | | | | |
| | Diseconomies of scale increase costs Duplication of IT systems depots, lorries increases average cost Costs of managing the change – redundancies, reorganisation, closure of depots, culture clash resolution Cost of new marketing campaigns Competitors respond aggressively (market is competitive) Less flexibility | | | | | | | |
| | Applica • | reference to finance da depots, lorries, delivery largest providers | | et segments, one of | | | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 2 of 12

| Question | Answer | | Marks |
|----------|--|---------|-------|
| 2(a) | Refer to Appendix 1 and other information. Calculate the gearing after the takeover of VantoU. | ratio | 4 |
| | Gearing ratio = non-current liabilities/non-current liabilities + sharehold equity | ders' | |
| | or non-current liabilities/capital employed | 1 mark | |
| | New LT loans and equity + retained earnings = 500 (300 + 200) and 1800 (600 + 800 + 400) | 2 marks | |
| | 500/2300 | 1 mark | |
| | New gearing ratio = 21.74 or 21.74% Some attempt | 1 mark | |
| | Other possibilities e.g. assets/equity 264 / 1000 = 26.4% | | |
| | or assets/non-current liabilities = 264 / 500 = 52.8% | | |
| 2(b) | Refer to lines 24–28. Calculate the difference between the current proposed annual depreciation expense of the IT equipment to be purchased in 2018. | | 4 |
| | Formula = purchase value – residual value/years | 1 mark | |
| | Original depreciation 20 – 5 / 5 = 3p.a. | 1 mark | |
| | New depreciation $20 - 8 / 3 = 4p.a$. | 1 mark | |
| | Change is \$1m | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 3 of 12

| Question | | | Answer | | | Marks | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|--|-------|--|
| 2(c) | Discuss the importance of the data in Appendix 1 to KKS's stakeholders. | | | | | | |
| | Level | Knowledge 2 marks | Application 2 marks | Analysis 4 marks | Evaluation 4 marks | | |
| | 2 | 2 marks Two or more relevant points made | 2 marks Application of two or more points to KKS | 3–4 marks Good use of theory to answer question | 3–4 marks Good judgement shown | | |
| | 1 | 1 mark One relevant point made | 1 mark Some application to KKS | 1–2 marks Some use of theory to answer question | 1–2 marks Some judgement shown | | |
| | 0 | | No creditable | e content | | | |
| | • | position, costs and refinancial equivalent of the equirements Accounts must be a auditors check this Accounts must enable as a p.l.c. accounts Directors need to knower (need accurate) | true and fair refle ele accurate asse are open to public ow situation to ta value of KKS), r | ection of the final essment and pay ic scrutiny so mulake strategic decorated in the strategic decorat | ncial situation – ment of taxes ust be accurate disions on e.g. take to know if 20% rise | | |
| | • | in promotion can be depend on accurate Shareholders need a Employees may find plans Managers decisions informed by accurate | knowledge) accurate figures accurate account on how to achie | to decide whethents help decide o | er to sell shares on their career | | |
| | | possible takeover place KKS is a plc plans for overseas e cost effect of HRM con may contain mate | expansion Thanges Trial relating to the | | | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 4 of 12

| Question | | | Answer | | | Marks |
|----------|--|---|--|---|---|-------|
| 3 | Evaluate the usefulness of a marketing plan for successful expansion through Option B. | | | | | |
| | Level | Knowledge 2 marks | Application 2 marks | Analysis 6 marks | Evaluation 6 marks | |
| | 2 | 2 marks Two or more relevant points | 2 marks Application of two or more points to PV | 4–6 marks Good use of theory to answer question | 4–6 marks Good judgement shown | |
| | 1 | 1 mark One relevant point made | 1 mark Some application to PV | 1–3 marks Some use of theory to answer question | 1–3 marks Some judgement shown | |
| | 0 | | No creditabl | e content | | |
| | Answer | Marketing plan sets into overall business Advantages are inte increased employee Audit of current posi sales, good brand no Objectives to renew The above analysis objectives in context Application by refere Plan can be monitor and customers Preparing the plan in if organisation object functional area plans | s plan grated marketing commitment as tion includes con ame sales revenue grenables KKS to o t of their market sence to Option B ed and adjusted nvolves cost of m tives are unclear | purpoach, incre purpose identifie npetitive market, rowth consider ways of situation with feedback from | ased efficiency, d falling profits and achieving om sales figures d possible conflict | |
| | random | on might consider the and not based on or ease for this reason. | | | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 5 of 12

| Question | Answer | | | | |
|----------|--|------------------|---|--|--|
| 4(a)(i) | Refer to Appendix 2. Draw a decision tree using this information | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Capital cost | Expected returns | | | |
| | 0.4 | | | | |
| | (32) | 50 | | | |
| | 0.6 | • | | | |
| | | 35 | | | |
| | 0.3 | 90 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | (45) | 40 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Drawing nodes and decision points | 2 marks | | | |
| | Correct figures entered | 2 marks | | | |
| | Some attempt at nodes/decision points | 1 mark | | | |
| | Some attempt at figures | 1 mark | | | |
| 4(a)(ii) | Calculate the expected monetary values for Option | s A and B | 2 | | |
| | Option A Expected value at decision node = $50 \times .4 + 35 \times .6 =$ | \$41m | | | |
| | Take off capital cost (–32) = \$9m | 1 mark | | | |
| | Use of probabilities or some attempt | 1 mark | | | |
| | Option B Expected value at decision node = $90 \times .3 + 40 \times .7 =$ | \$55m 1 marks | | | |
| | Take off capital cost (–45) = \$10m | 1 mark | | | |
| | Use of probabilities or some attempt | 1 mark | | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 6 of 12

| Question | Answer | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 4(b) | Recommend whether KKS should choose Option A or B. Justify your answer using your results from <u>4(a)</u> and other information. | | | | | | | |
| | Level | Knowledge 2 marks | Application 2 marks | Analysis 4 marks | Evaluation 4 marks | | | |
| | 2 | 2 marks Two or more relevant points made | 2 marks Application of two or more points to KKS | 3–4 marks Good use of theory to answer question | 3–4 marks Good judgement shown | | | |
| | 1 | 1 mark One relevant point made | 1 mark Some application to KKS | 1–2 marks Some use of theory to answer question | 1–2 marks Some judgement shown | | | |
| | 0 No creditable content | | | | | | | |
| | | Note to examiners: max L1 for A and E if only 3a results or other information used, recommendation essential for Level 2 A and E. | | | | | | |
| | • (| and price sensitive Option A market e could be very cost Option B (lowest for entering near start nigher costs and is Use of Ansoff's ma | tion A B2C = 9, O of return/net profit. es based on force e? What might the cale – what happe ghest profit but als e consumers. xpanding rapidly ly orecast) also expa t of rapid growth a s relatively more unatrix – Option A an | Is a difference of casts of sales and y be based on? In safter that? It is greatest risk as out low margins manding and offers and gaining brand inknown and B could be mand the sales and gaining brand and B could be mand the sales and sales and the sales and the sales are sales and the sales are | 1 significant? costs – how competitive market nean a misforecast advantage of loyalty but has | | | |
| | | on by justified rec levant points. | ommendation bas | sed on considerat | ion of the above or | | | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 7 of 12

| Question | | | Answer | | | Marks |
|----------|---|--|---|--|--|-------|
| 5 | Discuss whether KKS should introduce the new HR Director's proposed changes. (lines 63–67). | | | | | |
| | Level | Knowledge 2 marks | Application 2 marks | Analysis 6 marks | Evaluation 6 marks | |
| | 2 | 2 marks Good knowledge of relevant factors | 2 marks Application of two or more points to KKS | 4–6 marks Good use of theory to answer question | 4–6marks Good judgement shown in weighing up the factors | |
| | 1 | 1 mark Some knowledge of relevant factors | 1 mark Some application to KKS | 1–3 marks Some use of theory to answer question | 1–3 marks Some judgement shown | |
| | 0 | | No creditabl | e content | | |
| | • | development plus por Disadvantage is free working hard to mee Suggestions are to r MBO, increased for supervisors | edom can lead to et objectives as la nove to more tas | inefficiency and ack of supervision of crientated cult | employees not n ure reflected in | |
| | Factors | could include: | | | | |
| | • | Will more precise ta autonomy? | rgets be as motiv | ating as the curr | rent levels of | |
| | • | Will the increased cl efficiency Will involvement in s | | • | | |
| | • | arrangements Will employees becommitted or v.v. | ome more alienat | ted and less invo | lved and | |
| | • | Cost of changing to labour turnover | • | | | |
| | • | The meetings to disc Targets may be set resented | • | | • | |
| | • | Will the proposals le marketplace? | | • | changing | |
| | • | Will all objectives be Will redundancies le inevitable? | • | | ? Are they | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 8 of 12

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 5 | Discussion of factors should enable evaluative comments. These might be demonstrated through: A supported recommendation Consideration of the need for a change – does the firm actually know that the current arrangements have led to inefficiencies? How responsible are these for the fall in sales/profits? It looks as though something should be done. Most important factor or ranking of importance of factors in the decision Weighing up the impact on the business if proposal implemented Consideration of how much research has been done on possible impact of proposed changes | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 9 of 12

| Questi | on | | Answer | | Marks |
|--------|---|--|--|---|--------------|
| | | Questio | ns 6 and 7 use this r | narking grid: | |
| Level | Knowledge 3 marks | Application 3 marks | Analysis 4 marks | Evaluation 10 marks | |
| 3 | | | | 7–10 marks Good judgement shown throughout well supported conclusion/recommendation, focus KKS | |
| 2 | 3 marks Good understanding shown | 3 marks Good application to KKS | 3–4 marks Good use of reasoned argument or use of theory to explain points made to explain points made | 4–6 marks Some judgement shown in the may body of the answer and an attempt support conclusion/recommendation focused on KKS OR 0. effective and well supported conclusion/recommendation focus KKS | ot to on, |
| 1 | 1–2 marks Some understanding shown | 1–2 marks Some application to KKS | 1–3 marks Limited use of reasoned argument or use of theory to support points made | 1–3 marks Limited attempt to show judgement either within the answer OR a weakly supported conclusion/recommendation with stocus on KKS | |
| 0 | | <u>I</u> | No creditable c | ontent | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 10 of 12

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6 | Discuss the extent to which the information in Appendix 3 is sufficient strategic analysis to allow KKS to consider entering the market in country Y. | 20 |
| | Note to examiners: the question is about the role of the information, not whether to enter the new market. | |
| | Answers that contain application of one or more techniques using case material can be credited with K and P. A and E will require some comment in relation to the question | |
| | Answers could include: Identification of strategic analysis techniques: SWOT, PEST, Boston Matrix, Porters, core competencies Description of how APP 3 relates to the techniques (application) | |
| | Consideration of other information that may be useful in the decision including: | |
| | forecast costs market research data on revenue, prices, target customers exchange rates | |
| | labour market in country Y internal; changes required | |
| | Consideration of the role of strategic analysis in strategic planning: vision, objectives, analysis, choice, implementation, review Reference to the data in Appendix 3 and its use in analysis Role of analysis is to highlight factors that might make for success or failure and enable a correct decision to be taken regarding the two options for expansion Role of implementation is to select appropriate methods for expansion that give the maximum chance of success | |
| | Evaluation may be demonstrated by: judgements regarding the extent to which the data in App. 3 can be used in strategic analysis considering the relative importance of other information assessing the value of strategic analysis as opposed to other parts of | |
| | assessing the value of strategic analysis as opposed to other parts of strategic management in making a decision Candidates who appreciate that strategic management might suggest that the decision made is actually not the best way forward. Another possibility is to suggest as a contrast a possible scenario if no strategic management is carried out | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 11 of 12

| ii N ir | Evaluate how KKS could successfully achieve the strategic implementation of its decision to expand internationally. | 20 |
|---------------|--|----|
| ir | | |
| | Note to examiners: the decision is made- the question is not about how to implement a business plan in terms of production and marketing plans but the ways in which the organisation must prepare and manage its organisation for the change that such expansion will need. | |
| | Answers could include: description of the kind of changes such expansion requires in terms of the points in the final paragraph components of strategic implementation: business plans, the importance of culture and managing a change in existing culture, preparing contingency plans ldentification by senior staff of what is required to change Setting out a plan to do this then communicating the plan to staff in order to effect the changes listed in case Application of change management techniques to above: create positive climate identify key committed leaders for change (project champions) starting at the top give vision and clear objectives with reasons involve all concerned/affected by the changes provide training and appropriate rewards acknowledge and overcome resistance to change apply Kotters eight weeps strategy or freeze/unfreeze or other models for change management provide enough resources for the change Evaluation might be demonstrated by: consideration of the need to change the existing HRM and marketing arrangements - are they fit for the purpose of change? are directors suitably prepared and focused on/for changes (they have lots of proposals to consider) recommendation or ranking of proposals/techniques for change management | |

© UCLES 2017 Page 12 of 12