

2024 NCEA Assessment Report

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

General commentary

Understanding the business knowledge which may be assessed for each standard is essential to meeting the achievement criteria. Candidates who were able to incorporate correct understanding of the business concepts being assessed, such as 'pūtake', 'total quality management', 'societal expectations', 'business support agencies', 'quality assurance' and 'trade agreements' into their responses achieved higher grades than those who were unable to apply appropriate and correct business knowledge to their answers.

For achievement standards 91379 and 91380 there is a requirement for candidates to have studied a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context and to use this business in at least one of their responses. Candidates who used a business which meets this requirement were more able to provide relevant and appropriate responses. Those candidates who used businesses outside these parameters were unable to provide the evidence needed in their responses.

There is a level of literacy competency required to achieve these standards. Candidates who were able to correctly interpret the question being asked, understand terms used in the resource material such as 'minimum' and 'maximum', and write responses using complete sentences, had a greater likelihood of being able to communicate effectively the responses required.

The case study information provided to the candidates supplied them with information that could be incorporated to strengthen and support their responses. Candidates who included relevant information from the case study to demonstrate full understanding of the business concept being examined, were more able to achieve with Merit or Excellence.

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 examination 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 2024 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 (a) of the task required candidates to refer to an actual business they had studied. The task required candidates to apply their business knowledge to fully explain and evaluate how internal factors interact within a business that operates in a global context.

Commentary

Candidates who correctly interpreted the question being asked and answered accordingly were more likely to achieve the standard.

Candidates who demonstrated understanding of the specific quality management system being assessed, total quality management, were able to achieve at higher levels.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- understood the concept of pūtake and were able to apply it to the chosen business
- explained the concept of pūtake in relation to the positive impact on the brand
- used a New Zealand-registered business that operates in a global context in their response
- explained innovation in relation to the business' unique selling point and competitive advantage and / or impact on efficiency
- used examples to explain the negative aspects of innovation in relation to those costs associated with research and development and / or training
- explained total quality management in relation to quality chains and / or a significant change in the culture of an organisation, such as the interweaving of the responsibility of quality within a business between teams and / or stages of the supply chain with all stakeholders of the business such as suppliers.

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

- explained innovation in detail by linking to the business' competitive advantage and the impact on profitability
- focused on the internal impact on employees with detailed explanations of the positive and negative aspects of total quality management
- provided detailed explanations of concepts in relation to profitability and / or goals of the business, such as environmental sustainability.

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

- evaluated the likelihood of the success of innovation using new information. They included ideas such as timeframes and the type of industry
- evaluated the likelihood of the success of total quality management using new information. They included ideas such as the comparison of quality control with quality assurance methods.

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

- used Oarsome Aotearoa, the case study business, as their example business in their explanation of pūtake, brand and market share, rather than another New Zealand-registered business as the question specified
 - demonstrated incorrect understanding of market share
 - attempted explanations of innovation by focusing on changes to, and the impacts of the changes of, technology such as machinery and its associated costs
 - demonstrated incorrect understanding of a total quality management system
 - provided explanations of change management rather than inclusive change management, as the question specified.
-

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

Assessment

The examination 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 2024 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.

Commentary

Candidates who were able to correctly identify appropriate business support agencies were more able to achieve this standard.

Candidates who wrote succinctly, while targeting the specific question asked, were more likely to achieve at higher levels.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used a New Zealand-registered business that operates in a global context in their response
- explained a positive and negative impact of their chosen strategic response
- identified an agency that could support a New Zealand-registered business entering a new market and explained the benefit of the support. They included ideas such as consumer preferences, target markets, and regulations
- explained a threat when entering a new market and the likely impact this threat could have on the success of entering the new market.

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

- used a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context in their response
- explained a business-wide strategic response in terms of size, scope, and timeframe
- explained positive and / or negative impacts of their proposed strategic response; they included ideas such as how an increase in productivity leads to an increase sales, increasing revenue and, therefore, profits
- demonstrated understanding of social, cultural, and environmental sustainability and could apply these to their strategic response
- explained the link between sales, revenue, expenses, and profit.

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

- used a New Zealand-registered business that is operating in a global context in their response
- fully explained a business-wide strategic response in terms of size, scope, and timeframe
- explained positive and negative aspects of their proposed strategic response
- provided a justified conclusion by considering the positive and negative aspects of their proposed strategic response to form a conclusion on the likely success of the proposed strategic response
- added new information to the explanation of the positive and negative aspects of their proposed strategic response.

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

- did not use a New Zealand-registered business operating in a global context in their response
- did not explain a business-wide strategic response in terms of size, scope, or timeframe

- demonstrated incorrect understanding of cultural and / or social response to meet societal expectations
- demonstrated incorrect understanding of an agency that could support a New Zealand-registered business entering a new market
- provided responses which did not answer the specific question being asked.

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

Assessment

The examination 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 2024 Assessment Specifications, which were to fully explain the causes and effects of the problem, evaluate solutions, and make fully justified recommendations.

Commentary

Candidates who used the information provided in the resource booklet and / or exam booklet were more likely to achieve this standard.

Candidates who demonstrated understanding of the specific quality management system being assessed, quality assurance, and how this links to economic sustainability were more able to achieve at higher levels.

Candidates who demonstrated understanding of the benefits of free trade agreements were more likely to achieve this standard.

Candidates who provided fully explained links to business goals and outcomes were more able to achieve with Merit and Excellence.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- explained their answers by including both the 'what' and the 'why'
- included relevant information from the resource material in their responses.

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

- explained their answers fully by including the 'what', 'why', and how it impacts the business
- used relevant information from the resource material to strengthen their responses
- included sound reasoning in their answers.

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

- explained the benefit of each option fully by including the 'what', 'why', and how it impacts the business
- justified their recommendation by incorporating new information to support their choice
- strengthened their recommendation by referring to short term versus long term impacts, as well as the impacts on the business objectives.

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

- did not use the information provided in the resource material in their responses
- described the 'what', but did not explain their answers by also including the 'how'.