

National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2013 Assessment Report

Business Studies Level 3

- 91379 Demonstrate understanding of how internal factors interact within a business that operates in a global context**
- 91380 Demonstrate understanding of strategic response to external factors by a business that operates in a global context**
- 91381 Apply business knowledge to address a complex problem(s) in a given global business context**

COMMENTARY

Many candidates had obviously developed the skills of fully explaining business ideas and evaluation, which meet the requirements of the standards.

Stronger candidates were generally well versed in a suitable global business that they had studied in-depth. This may have resulted from strong productive educational links that had been made by some centres with suitable companies.

The Māori business concept, signalled in the assessment specification, was generally well understood and applied in a business context.

Some candidate responses were very long. However, this did not always ensure success, as ideas within the response were at times contradictory, and sometimes did not address the question.

Candidates should develop business literacy skills to enable them to provide extended answers to questions, and respond in a manner that shows they understand how businesses and their stakeholders are impacted by events. These skills clearly differentiate between higher and lower achieving candidates in all three papers.

STANDARD REPORTS

91379 Demonstrate understanding of how internal factors interact within a business that operates in a global context

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- explained business ideas showing a level of reasoning (the “because”). This showed that they understood the links between business concepts and application to the resource material
- used business ideas rather than “common sense” solutions to solve problems.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were awarded Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- stated ideas rather than explaining
- failed to attempt large parts of the questions
- provided weak, “common sense” answers rather than business knowledge
- lacked credible understanding of a business studied in-depth.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- fully explained business ideas by illustrating the importance of that idea in a business context and then showing how this impacts on the business or its stakeholders
- included business knowledge or Māori business concepts in their answers

- provided a summary of earlier discussion rather than provide conclusions on the significance of the factors/responses.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- justified decisions using new, relevant information that related to the business context in the question rather than repeating earlier comments
- integrated business knowledge in their answers
- provided strong answers across all three questions.

OTHER COMMENTS

The specific Māori business concept and the location of business were generally well understood. The question on investment appraisal was generally answered poorly. Many candidates failed to give answers in relation to the investment appraisal data in the resource material, and gave general answers instead. Change management was generally well understood. Candidates demonstrated understanding of leadership styles, but knowledge of change implementation methods was weaker.

91380 Demonstrate understanding of strategic response to external factors by a business that operates in a global context

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- explained external factors and the business' ability to achieve its growth strategy
- explained the positive and negative impacts of the strategic response.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were awarded Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- identified or described, rather than explained
- repeated the question in the answer without adding anything new
- failed to use business terms, and used generic terms such as money, stuff, and people, instead
- failed to read the questions properly and therefore provided answers which were not relevant.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- fully explained the strategic response which addressed two of: size, scope and timeframe
- fully explained the positives and/or negative impact of the strategic response on the business

- included relevant examples and business knowledge and terms to support explanations.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- added new information to the justified conclusion that had not been used in previous explanations
- integrated relevant examples, business knowledge and terms to fully support explanations.

OTHER COMMENTS

Candidates commonly confused cultural intelligence for marketing intelligence and wrote about marketing trends and research statistics. Candidates who did poorly often failed to provide explanations, and instead used bullet points or made statements.

91381 Apply business knowledge to address a complex problem(s) in a given global business context

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard demonstrated the required skills and knowledge. They typically:

- explained (what, why), using business language, a cause and (sometimes) an effect of the complex problem by referring to the given resource
- identified appropriate solutions to solve the complex problem
- explained a positive or negative effect of solution(s) on the business and/or a relevant stakeholder
- stated relevant examples from the given resource showing understanding of key terms
- used some business language that showed understanding of the concepts being assessed.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates who were awarded Not Achieved for this standard lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement. They typically:

- failed to refer to resource material or use business language in their answers
- provided solutions that were not relevant to the stated complex problem
- generalised the positive or negative effects, without reference to the related business
- did not read the questions accurately – especially the question headings which indicated what their answers should refer to
- did not attempt all parts of the question
- used key terms incorrectly. Terms used incorrectly included stakeholders, external factors and liquidation.
- used “money” when referring to one of the many financial flows in and out of a business.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Merit typically:

- fully explained causes and effects of complex problems on the relevant business, using appropriate business language
- fully explained relevant, specific positive and negative effects of appropriate solutions on the business and/or relevant stakeholders
- included relevant information from the given resources in their answers
- understood and provided clear definitions and examples of the key concepts being assessed.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

In addition to the skills and knowledge required for the award of Achievement with Merit, candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence typically:

- linked their fully explained causes and effects together rather than listing them separately
- discussed a range of stakeholders, not just one
- integrated the resource material into their answers, and supplemented this with their own business knowledge
- justified solutions by comparing them and indicating why one was better than the other, using new evidence to clearly show that the solution solved the complex problem as it had been stated
- displayed a high level of business knowledge and understanding, using key concepts correctly.

OTHER COMMENTS

Merit and Excellence candidates showed very good understanding of the key concepts being assessed – namely marketing, quality methods and intellectual property rights. Candidates who gained higher grades, examined the consequences of an issue for the business or its stakeholders (the 'how' of a fully explained).

Few candidates were able to consistently justify the better solution, by stating how it was better than the other solution in solving the problem, and clearly providing a new reason why it was the better solution.