1 (Bakos and Treacy)

Bargaining power is the ability of one or other party to an exchange to affect the outcome of that exchange. Informal statements of this same principle are acceptable. "Bargaining power is power in a bargain" is not acceptable. Two points.

The three factors contributing to bargaining power are unique (product) features, search-related costs, and switching costs. Semi-formal statements are okay (largely the right words, hopefully); examples are not. Two points each.

Two ways in which electronic publishers may have a competitive advantage. The ones I was looking for are inter-organizational and internal efficiency; internal in terms of how they manage the process themselves (all being online) and inter-organizational in terms of being able to incorporate the reviewers, editors, etc, into their processes (e.g. getting authors to submit articles in the right format.) Other examples are acceptable as long as they refer to one of the five Bakos and Treacy conditions. If they're just "people might prefer to read things online" (without making it a little clearer that this might be a unique product feature), then it doesn't get the point; while saying "electronic articles can be searched, which is a feature that paper-based journals don't have" is good for the grade. Again, two points for each.

2 (Processes)

Workflow assist an organization in self-monitoring through (1) standardizing procedures, so that specific events can be compared to expectations; (2) centralizing control so that exceptions are minimized; (3) making steps in the process visible. Basically, any plausible answer involving standardization and the introduction of discrete steps is fine.

What two aspects of competitive advantage? Internal efficiency and inter-organizational efficiency, again. Two points each. (Prob. not other answers unless they're very persuasive.)

The role of centralization in workflow is to consolidate control over the process representation, and hence over the ways in which the work is conducted. Also, it allows for a process representation to be changed more easily. An alternative answer is that it allows process reengineering to be enforced, by making sure that actions follow processes. Pretty much anything like this will get the two points.

3 (Metaphors)

Examples: I'm thinking of things like the scientific community (responding by making it easier to collect and cite information, providing timely dissemination, incorporating peer review, adopting standards and forms of practice such as the gene database etc), the competitive environment (e.g. other journals… touting electronic circulation, keeping to the structure of editors, etc.) Again, plausible answers get the grades.

4 (Marginal Costs)

The marginal cost of production is the cost of manufacturing/producing n+1 of an item, when n of the item have already been produced. That is, the cost of a single element in an iterated sequence

of production. An alternative is that people might think the "phrase" I refer to is "driven down to…" so they'll also get the grade for saying that prices fall, limited by the cost of producing a single item. Saying "prices fall but not below the marginal cost of production" – that is, not explaining the concept of marginality – doesn't get the grade.

The difference between the margincal cost of online and paper-based journals? Marginal costs of journals involve paper, ink, manufacturing, and distribution. Marginal cost of online publication is almost zero (just labor costs, and much of the labor is free.)

5 (Database)

After 1NF:

Eliminate the repetition of author details and reviewer details]

[paper title, author name, author address, author affiliation, reviewer name, reviewer address, reviewer recommendation, date submitted, date finalized]

key is either title or title + author name

After 2NF:

This depends on the selection of key. If key is atomic, there's no 2NF reduction. If they had title + author, then we'd have

[author name, author address, author affiliation]

[paper title, author name, reviewer name, reviewer address, reviewer recommendation, date submitted, date finalized]

After 3NF:

Eliminate non-key dependencies. In particular, the dependence of reviewer address on reviewer, and of reviewer recommendation on reviewer name as well as paper title.

[author name, author address, author affiliation] (key: name)

[reviewer name, reviewer address] (key: name)

[paper title, author name, date submitted, date finalized] (key: title or title & author)

[paper title, reviewer name, reviewer recommendation] (key: title & reviewer name)

Two points for each of the transformations, plus two points for specifying the key fields at each stage. Partial credit for getting things wrong at one stage but being consistent.

In ER models, the difference is that single-valued attributes are added as columns to the entity (or relationship) table, but that multi-valued attributes have new tables created for them (otherwise they would necessitate adding multiple entries to the existing tables, which would violate the rule that key fields uniquely identify table rows since now we'd have multiple rows with the same key.)