

# Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
in Applied Business (6922)  
Unit 7: Investigating Enterprise

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6922\_01\_1606\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **Administration**

This series, most samples of the work were again received on time together with the appropriate forms and were signed to indicate authenticity. In general, marks on the work conformed to those on the 'OPTEMS' with occasional discrepancies.

## **Annotation of Portfolio Work**

It is worth noting again that the minimum requirement for annotation of portfolios is laid down in the Code of Practice to be identification of where a candidate's evidence of criteria coverage may be found in the work. There were again a few examples where little or no annotation was evident and moderators were left trying to identify where and how marks had been awarded.

The recommendation to annotate by reference to 'Mark Band' achieved and 'Strand', 'Theme' or 'Area' covered e.g. MB1a, MB2b etc. is still not being followed by some Centres but, however this is done, it is worth emphasising again the importance of clear annotation and internal standardisation for the benefit of candidates as well as for external moderation purposes.

## **Presentation of Portfolio Work**

The preferred format remains loose-leaf or treasury-tagged sheets that can be easily opened and read. Although less in evidence, there still remains the issue of inaccessibility and unsuitable presentation of some of the portfolios with work either tightly packed into plastic wallets (that split on opening), left in ring binders or clipped into plastic folders (this simply makes the process of extracting the work more laborious than should be the case).

## **General Issues with the Specification:**

Although most centers included witness statements for strand C regarding candidates' performance, there was insufficient evidence from some candidates to support the marks awarded by the assessor.

## **Quality of Written Communication 'QWC'**

Few assessors appear to specifically record the marks available for the level achieved. Up to 3 marks for 'QWC' can be given in (b) and these are part of the total mark available for the strand which remains at 18. In general, where such marks had been given, these appear to have been beneficial to candidates.

## Areas of the Specification

Again this unit had one of the smallest entries. This is probably due to the need to run an enterprise over time which requires substantial work commitment outside lesson time.

**Strand A:** Those centers that used Young Enterprise as a vehicle for this unit tended to achieve higher marks than those who organized a 'one-off' event. However candidates do need to make it clear how the business enterprise is structured and the company name. There was very little evidence that the structure and company name had been considered. The enterprise should be set up as a private limited company and not a partnership.

Some kept detailed records in diaries/journals and these were the centers that did best on this unit. Much of the evidence for candidate involvement comes from the diaries. Diaries also show timelines and make activities clear. They support the other three strands. Some candidates found it difficult to discuss what they did and tended to use the collective person, i.e. "we". Evidence needed witness statements to support diaries/commentaries, these were not always present. It is suggested that candidates be encouraged to demonstrate their contribution through their diaries clearly.

The center has to ensure that the product/service of the company involves sufficient activity to enable all candidates to have an active input to enable them to move out of mark band 1.

A substantial business activity is required. Centers must also ensure that the group size is appropriate.

Candidates are required to undertake a self-evaluation in this strand. These were often unsubstantiated or, in many cases, were simply a description of what they did and did not do. Many candidates did not include this self-evaluation at this point.

**Strand B:** Some centers produced excellent work for this strand with clear descriptions of roles and responsibilities as well as supported evaluations of team members in these roles.

**Strand C:** The witness statements for the presentation were often brief and needed much greater detail. Where clear and detailed witness statements showing substantial contribution were present, centers could move candidates into mark band 3. Witness statements do need supporting evidence from candidates showing originality of thought and outstanding contribution to the group report and presentation.

Where roles or contribution was minor it was extremely difficult for candidates to move outside mark band 1.

Candidates also should include their own PowerPoint printouts, cue cards, etc. and identify their own input to the presentation. The center must also ensure that a full copy of the group presentation is sent for moderation to enable individual input to be gauged. The centers should not restrict themselves to the one side of the exemplar witness statement pro-forma found in the qualification guidance and on the Pearson website. This is only a guide and centers must ensure that they make full and clear statements about candidate input into the company and the presentation. Where the activity/event was too small candidates could not generate sufficient evidence.

Where a company report is produced as well as the individual portfolios, this must be sent with the sample.

Centre assessors must ensure that they tie their witness statements to the descriptions used in the mark bands. There were occasions where assessors noted strong contribution to the group presentation but the candidate evidence and the marks awarded did not reflect higher mark bands.

**Strand D:** This strand needs the financial outcomes of the company to be used to enable effective evaluations. This did not always happen. Evaluation was often limited to making a profit. Therefore marks were often restricted to mark band 1.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:  
<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

