



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced  
Level In Business (WBS14) Paper 01

## **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)

January 2025

Publications Code WBS14\_01\_2501\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

## **General**

The paper proved to be an accessible paper for most candidates. The paper discriminated well, with candidates accessing a wide range of marks, with some good and very good responses.

Strong candidates did well, using their subject knowledge to effectively develop chains of reasoning to assess and evaluate the question. By contrast there were some very weak answers that either failed to show accurate knowledge of the topic being assessed or failed to develop logical chains of reasoning that were contextualised

Some candidates missed out on marks due to not answering the question set. This was a particular problem for question 1d and question 3, which cost some candidate valuable marks

It is worth reminding future candidates of the need to apply proper context to all responses. Copying of the text from the extract without using it to create an argument, should be avoided.

## **Report on individual questions**

### **Section A**

#### **Questions 1a**

This question was answered well by many candidates, with them showing the ability to calculate the number of Indonesians under the age of 15 in 2022 using the data given in Extract A. There are, however, some candidates that failed to show their workings, which prevented them from getting marks where they had the incorrect answer. Moreover, some candidates failed to use the millions in their answers, displaying the incorrect number of under 15's. Candidates should be encouraged to write out the formula and show their workings on all calculation questions.

#### **Question 1b**

This question was answered well by a large number of candidates. There were a number of different ways this could have been approached, and many different advantages were seen, such as Increase in incomes, increase in employment, and increase in tax revenues. It is worth reminding candidates that no marks are given for a definition, and that the application needs to be linked to the knowledge or argument, which means it should be used to create or support an argument. There are still some candidates that just copy of text from the extract and fail to use it to support their answer

### **Question 1c**

This question proved to be a little more challenging for some candidates due to their lack of understanding of the topic, joint venture. A joint venture is a collaboration between two independent businesses on a specific project or venture (it is not a merger or takeover, which some candidates went on to mistakenly discuss). Furthermore, some candidates failed to fully address the question as they discussed the benefits to the economy instead of Hyundai. As a result, some failed to reach the higher levels, due to the lack of knowledge of the topic and understanding of the question. Some candidates are still including a conclusion in their answers, which is not needed on an 8-mark question

### **Question 1d**

Instead of focussing on the impact specialisation has on an economy, some candidates discussed the benefits to a business. Candidates should make sure that they have fully read the question to ensure that they are fully addressing what is asked. Those candidates that understood the question, went on to develop some effective arguments to why and how an economy such as Indonesia could benefit from this. The candidates that reached the top of the higher levels, balanced their arguments with the potential drawbacks to an economy of specialisation. These candidates created convincing arguments with well-developed chains of reasoning addressing the cause and consequences. There are a number of candidates that just write a summary as part of their conclusion, repeating what has already been discussed, consequently no adding anything to their answers. Candidates should be encouraged to develop their conclusion, adding value to the answer that they have already written.

### **Question 1e**

This question was answered well by many candidates understanding the importance of infrastructure when choosing a production location. The key area that differentiated candidates here was their ability to link this back to a production location rather than a market location. There was good use of the extract on this question and some very good balanced arguments about other factors such as cost of labour that may be more important. As with question 1d the conclusions here were sometimes not as well developed as expected for the top of level 4 'leading to a supported judgement' There were however some candidates that did not understand the term 'infrastructure' and as a result tried to use anything in the extract to support an argument which was incorrect.

## **Section B**

### **Question 2**

This was an accessible question for most candidates as they understood the concept of organic and inorganic growth and as a result were able to evaluate both options linking these to Mountain Warehouse and Mars. There were many responses that had wide ranging arguments; however, candidates often rush through a number of benefits and drawbacks without fully completing their arguments. Candidates should make sure that they develop a chain of reasoning before making another point in their argument explaining the cause or consequence of their suggestion. There are still some candidates that mix up organic growth with internal sources of finance and inorganic growth with external sources of finance when both options can use any source of finance to grow. As with question 3 there are many that just summarise what has already been said in their recommendation and do not offer anything extra to show a wider appreciation of the question.

### **Question 3**

This question proved to be more challenging than question 2 for many candidates as they misunderstood the question which was to 'Evaluate the usefulness of Ansoff matrix when making marketing decisions.' There were many responses that just evaluated the use of the 4 different strategies on Ansoff matrix i.e. the benefit and drawbacks of market penetration, diversification etc. Many failed to assess why the tool may not be useful when making marketing decisions e.g. fails to address to competitive actions and external factors such as PESTLE factors. Many candidates do not give significant time to their evaluation and cut their balanced arguments short, not showing a full appreciation of competing arguments. There were however some strong responses from candidates that read and understood the question and in these responses, they used the context well to support their arguments.



