Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson AS GCE

In Business (8BS0) Paper 1 Marketing and People

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 or 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.

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

Introduction

The overall standard of responses was similar to previous years. Candidates demonstrated some understanding of the majority of Theme 1 terminology, although definitions were not always clear or concise, with many writing far more than necessary for the 2 mark 'What is meant by' questions.

There was a lack of understanding of the demands of each question. Many candidates provided evaluation in the 4 mark 'Explain' questions and spent too much time on these, to the detriment of the rest of the paper. There was then a lack of evaluation for the levels of response questions where evaluation allows candidates to access higher marks. It is important that candidates have a good understanding of the structure of each type of question. Using past paper mark schemes and exemplar responses can help with this and enable candidates to manage their time better when sitting the paper.

Q1a) Many candidates provided a definition of market share rather than market size.

Q1b) The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of the term, with many gaining the full 2 marks for this question.

Q1c) Generally well answered. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to identify how many decimal places they should give. Some candidates lost a mark for not giving 2 decimal places as asked for in the question.

Q1d) As in previous years, candidates struggled to define added value. Many gave vague definitions of differentiation or USP. Those that did demonstrate understanding were also able to use the extract to gain application marks, but sometimes failed to gain the analysis mark by providing a consequence. Some candidates wasted time evaluating their point by providing a 'however.' This is not a requirement of 'Explain' questions.

Q1e) The vast majority of candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge of at least one pricing strategy, but many were not able to effectively demonstrate strategies that were suitable for Sundried. This therefore limited the application, analysis and evaluation marks they were able to achieve.

Q1f) Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of brand and often applied it effectively to the sportswear industry. Many responses focused on how to build a brand rather than the importance of having a strong brand. Candidates also struggled to assess their answers by suggesting other factors that might lead to the success of a business of this type.

Q2a) Many candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the term, but some provided a description of zero hour contracts rather than flexible working.

Q2b) Generally well answered, with the majority of candidates gaining the full 2 marks.

Q2c) A surprising number of candidates could not demonstrate knowledge of Taylor's scientific management theory despite the advanced notice given to

centres that the motivational theories would be a topic on this paper. Some candidates attempted to use the extract when their knowledge was lacking, which resulted in answers about non-financial incentives. This was another question where some candidates attempted to assess their answer and therefore wasted valuable time that should have been spent on the questions that offer higher marks.

Q2d) Candidates generally demonstrated some understanding of employer/employee relations and made good use of the extract. However, many did not gain the analysis mark as they did not explain the link between open and honest communication and improving employer/employee relations. Instead, they focused on profit or productivity, which did not answer the question.

Q2e) Candidates demonstrated good understanding of non-financial techniques, often making good use of the extract to add context to their response. Some struggled to provide a balanced response on one or both of their points.

Q2f) This question was generally well answered. The majority of responses were balanced, but there was a lack of context in many. Candidates did not make use of the extract to identify the Passport scheme used by Admiral which would have been useful context to support their points.

Q3 It was evident that candidates had struggled to manage their time effectively and did not always finish this question. There was some good use of the extract to provide well contextualised answers. Many candidates did not provide two assessed points, often focusing on one of the two options rather than discussing both innovation and promotional methods. There was some evidence that candidates were not confident in their understanding of innovation, preferring instead to discuss the pros and cons of two promotional methods. This meant that they did not fully answer the question and therefore restricted the marks they could achieve.

Those candidates that were able to demonstrate knowledge of both innovation and promotional methods also made good use of the extract to add context. However, chains of analysis were often undeveloped and did not link to profitability.