

2023 NCEA Assessment Report

Subject:	Business Studies
Level:	Level 3
Achievement standard(s):	91379, 91380, 91381

General commentary

Using a clear structure to write responses provides candidates with a good opportunity to reach Achievement. Explaining the impact the situation / action could have on business or stakeholder goals provides candidates the opportunity to achieve with Merit. To achieve with Excellence, candidates need to bring new information into their response.

Having a good understanding of the business knowledge required for each standard is essential to meet the criteria for Achievement. Candidates who incorporated correct understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as 'quality assurance', 'innovation', 'top-down change management', 'trademark', and 'trade agreements' into their responses achieved higher grades than those who did not apply appropriate and correct business knowledge to their answers.

The case study information provided to candidates supplied them with information that could be incorporated to strengthen and support their responses. To gain Achievement, candidates need to go beyond simply restating this information and include their own business knowledge in their responses. Candidates who integrated relevant information from the case study or business they studied achieved higher by showing a full understanding of the business concept being examined.

Candidates who correctly interpreted business terms in this assessment, such as size, scope, and timeframe, achieved highly by incorporating these in their responses. This included referring to sales, revenue, and profit correctly.

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

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

Assessment

The assessment consisted of one task with four parts; candidates were required to complete all four parts of the task. The task covered the requirements of the 2023 Assessment Specifications, which were to demonstrate understanding of how internal factors interact within a given business context or by a business that candidates had studied. Part (c) of the task required candidates to refer to an actual business they had studied. The task required candidates to apply their business knowledge to explain and evaluate how internal factors interact within a business that operates in a global context.

Commentary

Candidates who demonstrated understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as specific quality management strategies, change management strategies, and intellectual property rights, typically achieved at higher levels.

Candidates who demonstrated correct understanding of business terminology, such as revenue, costs, and profit, did well. Candidates who integrated detailed and relevant information from the case study or an appropriate business they had studied were also able to achieve higher grades.

Structured responses that included 'what', 'why', 'how', 'impact', or conjunctions such as 'because' or 'therefore' allowed candidates to demonstrate higher levels of understanding.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- applied appropriate information from the case study to relevant areas of business knowledge
- demonstrated understanding of the business concept being assessed, such as innovation, trademarks, and top-down change management, by explaining how the concept affected the business or a stakeholder.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- applied business terminology correctly
- explained how the business concept impacts the business or stakeholder goals
- used evidence from the resource material or their own case study where appropriate to support and strengthen their response.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- brought new appropriate and relevant information into their conclusions
- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the business concept being assessed, such as top-down change management or innovation
- compared the short- and long-term economic impacts on the business, or discussed additional impacts on the business, employees, or stakeholders.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- repeated material from the background information or case study presented, without including their own business knowledge
 - did not provide evidence from a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context
 - did not answer the question that was asked.
-

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

Assessment

The assessment consisted of one task with four parts; candidates were required to complete all four parts of the task. The task covered the requirements of the 2023 assessment specifications, which were to demonstrate understanding of a strategic response to external factors by the business in the context provided, or by a business that candidates had studied. Part (c) of the task required candidates to refer to an actual business they had studied. The task required candidates to identify appropriate strategic responses to external factors, and to apply their business knowledge to explain and evaluate the strategic responses to external factors undertaken by a business that operates in a global context.

Commentary

Candidates who applied key terms such as size, scope, and timeframe to their chosen strategy tended to achieve at higher levels. Using evidence from a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context provided candidates with greater ability to achieve this standard. Understanding terminology such as revenue, costs, and profit tended to achieve at higher levels.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- identified appropriate strategic responses to the problem presented
- demonstrated understanding of the business concept being assessed, such as kaitiakitanga or cultural intelligence
- stated the answer and explained it with reasons why, linking their response to the business / stakeholders.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- provided full explanations that applied business knowledge correctly to the situation given
- explained the impact the chosen strategic response or event / action could have on the business
- applied business terminology correctly.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- described the size, scope, or timeframe of the chosen strategic response
- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the business concept being assessed, such as cultural intelligence and a change in consumer behaviour
- incorporated new appropriate and relevant information into their conclusions
- compared the short- and long-term economic impacts on the business, or discussed additional impacts on the business, employees, or stakeholders.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not identify an appropriate strategic response for the problem presented
- referred to the incorrect business in their responses by using Top Cache rather than Saver Shed

- did not demonstrate understanding of the impact of the business concept, such as the entry of a multinational business or kaitiakitanga, being assessed
 - did not provide evidence from a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context.
-

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

Assessment

The assessment consisted of one task with four parts; candidates were required to complete all four parts of the task. The task covered the requirements of the 2023 assessment specifications, which were to explain the causes and effects of the problem, evaluate solutions, and make justified recommendations. The task required candidates to apply their business knowledge to address complex problems in the given global business context.

Commentary

Candidates who demonstrated understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as trade agreements, tended to achieve at higher levels. Candidates who incorporated business knowledge beyond that provided in the case study tended to achieve at higher levels. Applying a solution and new information to the named business helped candidates to achieve at Excellence level.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- demonstrated understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as the impact of quality management on employees, business location issues, supply chains, and trade agreements
- referenced the resource material provided
- stated the answer and explained it with reasons why, and linked their response to the business / stakeholders.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- provided full explanations by applying business knowledge correctly to the situation given, and linking their responses to the impact on business objectives
- appropriately used evidence from the resource material provided to support and strengthen their response, including making calculations where appropriate
- applied business terms correctly.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- “fully” explained their options before drawing a conclusion
- brought new appropriate and relevant information into their conclusion
- integrated business knowledge and relevant examples from the case study into their explanations

- demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the business concepts being studied, such as the impact of quality management, business location issues, supply chain issues, and trade agreements
- compared the short- and long-term economic impacts on the business, or discussed additional impacts on the business, employees, or stakeholders.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- stated information from the resource material without applying business knowledge
 - did not demonstrate understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as quality management, business location issues, supply chain issues, and trade agreements
 - stated the answer, but did not link ideas or explain why it occurred.
-