

**Pearson LCCI  
Level 3 Accounting (2008  
Syllabus)  
(ASE3012)**

**Annual Qualification  
Review  
2012/2013**

---

## CONTENTS

---

Introduction .....	2
Pass Rate Statistics .....	2
General Strengths and Weaknesses .....	3
Teaching Points by Syllabus Topic .....	4
Examples of Candidate Responses .....	5

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

The annual qualification review provides qualification-specific support and guidance to centres. This information is designed to help teachers preparing to teach the subject and to help candidates preparing to take the examination.

The reviews are published in September and take into account candidate performance, demonstrated in both on demand and series examinations, over the preceding 12 months. Global pass rates are published so that teachers can measure the performance of your centre against these.

The review identifies candidate strengths and weaknesses by syllabus topic area and provides examples of more able and less able candidate responses. It should, therefore, be read in conjunction with details of the structure and learning objectives contained within the syllabus for this qualification found on the website.

The review also identifies any actual or proposed changes to the syllabus or question types together with their implications.

---

## PASS RATE STATISTICS

---

The following statistics are based on the performance of candidates who took this qualification between 1 October 2012 and 31 August 2013.

Global pass rate    41.93%

Grade distributions

Pass	15.01%
Merit	15.89%
Distinction	11.03%

---

## **GENERAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

---

### **Strengths**

- Presentation, in most centres
- Improvement on written sections

### **Weaknesses**

- Poor time allocation
- Inability to deal with topics from Levels 1 and 2. Candidates must be aware that the syllabi are cumulative, and anything in the Levels 1 and 2 syllabi is examinable at Level 3

---

## TEACHING POINTS BY SYLLABUS TOPIC

---

### Topic 1 (Covered in S4 2012 Q1, S2 2013 Q1, S3 2013 Q2)

Candidates are expected to cover Levels 1 and 2 topics at a higher level.

**S4 2012** and **S2 2013** both asked for calculations rather than explicit double entry. Too many candidates set out their responses in ways markers found very difficult to follow.

**S3 2013** This was a more direct test of book-keeping and was both set out and answered well by many candidates.

### Topic 2 (S3 2013 Q2)

Candidates seem to like this topic and usually score highly on basic calculations. However, questions that are more unorthodox or involve written sections are answered less well. This applied to the question set.

### Topic 3 (S4 2012 Q3)

Layout is vital, especially when ledger accounts involving more than one year are involved. This certainly applied in this question, in which many candidates performed well on a written section testing basic factual knowledge.

### Topic 4 (S3 2013 Q3)

Again, layout is very important. This is a topic where many candidates score highly on basic issues. This was the case here.

Journals, a regular topic in this exam, were often answered very well.

### Topic 5

No major questions were set on this area, although it did feature on small sections in some questions (see Topic 7 below).

### Topic 6 (S4 2012 Q4, S2 2013 Q3, S3 2013 Q5)

This (and all subsequent topics) is not examined explicitly at lower levels.

Candidates are good at calculating basic numbers, such as goodwill, retained earnings and minority interest. They tend to have more difficulty with fair values and, especially, distinguishing between transactions in individual company accounts and group accounts.

**S4 2012** Covered the basic numbers mentioned above and was answered well.

**S2 2013** An unusual scenario, but answered reasonably well because it was structured in a way that helped candidates.

**S3 2013** This reflected the general comments above: good on basics, poor on distinguishing transactions.

#### **Topic 7 (S4 2012 Q2, S2 2013 Q2)**

Candidates are usually good at preparing basic statements, but poor at applying their knowledge to questions that ask for specific areas, or extracts. Many, whatever is asked, produce a full cash flow as a result of rote learning.

**S4 2012** An unusual question, but asked in a way candidates might expect, and many scored well.

**S2 2013** Perhaps a slightly easier question, and many scored well. Part of the question related to Topic 5, showing that more than one topic can be examined in any one question.

#### **Topic 8 (S4 2012 Q4, S2 2013 Q5)**

Arguably, this is the most popular topic with candidates. They are invariably better at ratios mentioned in the Level 2 syllabus, and tend to find the ratios more difficult in the Level 3 syllabus, which are more advanced.

**S4 2012** Basic ratios were answered well; applying them to a real world scenario, which has been tested in a similar way previously, was not.

**S3 2013** *Incomplete records* and *ratios* are explicitly in the syllabus, and many candidates answered well. As suggested above, results on Level 3 ratios were often poor.

#### **Topics 9 and 10 (S4 2012 Q5, S2 2013 Q3, S3 2013 Q3)**

These areas are also covered by other exams available in the LCCIEB portfolio, and some candidates clearly benefit from this. Results on these topics are more variable than elsewhere: some answers are very good, but many are poor or very poor.

**S4 2012** A mainstream topic in an unusual form. Many candidates found this difficult and did not come-to-terms with the question.

**S2 2013** Basic, but testing, numbers. This was answered well by those who set out strongly and remained logical. Many answers were difficult to follow, and as such, difficult to mark.

**S3 2013** An unusual question, but (a) and (e) were straightforward. Too many candidates only answered (a), failing to appreciate that written sections can usually be answered without having numbers correct or even not attempting to give them.

## Topic 11

This was not examined in the three exams. It is almost certain to be tested in a written section, and the examiner will not set any question that is entirely written. As such, other topics will be examined in a question involving Topic 11.

### Further guidance

- Predicting what will be tested is pointless. The question setter does not set questions to any pattern
- Choosing which question *not* to attempt is a key skill. Candidates should read all questions before they decide
- Less able candidates all too often choose the wrong question
- Written sections should always be attempted. Markers allow for the fact that English is not the first language of many candidates. However, writing nothing will always score no marks
- Time allocation, as in all exams, is a vital skill

---

## EXAMPLES OF CANDIDATE RESPONSES

---

### ACTUAL QUESTION PERFORMANCE

All the examples are attempts at Q1 on S3 2013.

#### DISTINCTION LEVEL (22/25)

Not well set out  
But can follow  
Sufficient workings  
Scored heavily throughout  
Few errors

#### MERIT LEVEL (15/25)

Well set out  
Did as set, although parts in wrong order  
Logic always correct  
Although some errors

#### PASS LEVEL (13/25)

Well set out  
Did as set  
Struggled on more technical numbers

#### FAIL LEVEL (4/25)

Well set out  
a) Went astray after early promise  
b) No obvious attempt  
c) Most numbers wrong, and can't obtain follow on marks from (b)

**Pearson**  
190 High Holborn  
London  
WC1V 7BH  
Tel. +44 (0) 247 651 8951  
Fax. +44 (0) 247 651 6566  
Email. [internationalenquiries@pearson.com](mailto:internationalenquiries@pearson.com)  
[www.lcci.org.uk](http://www.lcci.org.uk)  
[www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)