

# Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

## Summer 2010

GCSE

### GCSE Applied Business (5AB03) Paper 01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated Business And Economics telephone line: 0844 372 2187

Summer 2010

Publications Code UG023421

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## PE Report On Examination Paper 5AB03/01

### General Comments

#### The Controlled Assessment Activities:

The work seen was very limited this series and, as with 5AB01, ranged from applied use of material drawn from real businesses to a more remote 'hands off' approach from text book or case study sources. Some assessors indicated clearly how and where assessment criteria had been met whilst others provided little or no evidence in support of their decisions (see under 'Annotation of Work' below).

In some cases it was evident that information (images, pictures, maps and graphs) had been downloaded. Where information has been downloaded, this needs to be clarified as having been done during research time rather than during 'controlled conditions' as this is not permitted. Where this, or plagiarism is found, the work will be referred to the Compliance section of the Awarding Body. In some cases, there was evidence of whole sections simply reproduced without much comment; this is not permissible. There was also evident a degree of 'prescription' that was also questionable in its legitimacy.

#### Annotation of Work

As a minimum there needs to be an indication of where marks have been awarded for research, presentation, analysis and decision making, evaluation and methodology as prescribed in the assessment criteria. The absence of any annotation (indicating how marks had been awarded) makes it very difficult for candidates to achieve the marks as given and is unhelpful to any form of moderation (internal or external). In future, work without annotation may be returned to Centres for assessors to complete.

#### Activity 1

As with 5AB01, assessors need to consider the suitability of all chosen businesses particularly the larger supermarket chains where candidates often had difficulty in focussing on particular aspects of their operations.

Much of the work seen here was generic; could have applied to any business and lacked depth. This was often done better where the smaller business had been considered. 'Customer expectations' tended to be generic and any evaluation tended to be limited and/or of the business itself rather than of this aspect of the business. 'Recruitment' was likewise rather generalised and few candidates identified job roles for which their CV's might be suitable (some omitted this requirement completely).

Although most candidates had tackled the set tasks, in one instance the tasks had been re-written emphasising other aspects of business that did not match either the specification or the activity. In such a case it was difficult to agree with the marks given.

## Activity 2

Much of the work was superficial with limited analysis and little use of the required location maps or references to these. Candidates did not seem to have understood that many large businesses are multi-faceted and have many products and locations and thus make mention of this when tackling issues of location. There was virtually no analysis of why a particular business might choose to relocate although this is part of the set activity.

## Activity 3

Candidates produced a largely generic approach that meant that the work contained very basic information and lacked focus e.g. on how the business might respond to external influences. Instead, any evaluation tended to be of the whole business and did not address the required tasks i.e. **three** factors that make its goods and/or services competitive; **two** ways in which technology is used to maintain or improve its competitiveness; how economic conditions have affected the business and **two** ways in which the business affects the environment and how such effects may be managed.

### Assessment Criteria:

#### Research

It is important that assessor comments support the marks given. This is particularly so where no bibliography is required. Assessors will have witnessed the candidates' research activities and a clear statement will justify any mark given. Sometimes this had to be inferred from the work itself and, in other cases, it was difficult to see how a particular mark had been chosen.

#### Present information

Most of the work was reasonably well presented but there were instances of muddled presentation, activities out of sequence, no headings, paragraphs and so on that detracted from the clarity of the work. Again, as with the research, it is important for assessors to justify the marks given.

#### Decision making

There was some evidence of analysis throughout most of the work seen. Simply making comparisons, reaching simple conclusions based on findings and making judgements can constitute analysis. Also, 'QWC' is embedded here and in the subsequent criterion so marks can be given for clarity, spelling and expression.

#### Review/evaluation of activity

The candidate is required to evaluate each task and/or their personal and any group involvement in each activity. In practice, one reflection could cover all three activities and be kept to a minimum to avoid repetition.

Better candidates should be encouraged to evaluate their business findings so that evaluation is of their understanding from the investigations of the businesses rather than too focussed on the personal aspects.

## **Methodology**

It would have been helpful to see any planning sheets and to have a tutor comment to support the methodology mark given. As with 'research', an assessor statement as to how the candidate set about the tasks would help to justify any mark given. Some candidates had clearly been well guided whilst the work of others lacked much evidence of 'planning' and marks were difficult to agree.

## **Administration**

In most instances these issues were properly addressed but there were cases where the sample did not include highest and lowest or where signatures were missing from authentication statements and these had to be requested separately.

Some of the work was received very late.

## Grade Boundaries - June 2010

5AB03	Total	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Raw Mark	100	80	71	62	54	46	39	32	25
UMS	120	108	96	84	72	60	48	36	24

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UG023421 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH