



# **GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

**APPLIED BUSINESS  
AS/Advanced**

**SUMMER 2014**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

### **Online results analysis**

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

	<b>Page</b>
Unit 1	3
Unit 2	6
Unit 3	7
Unit 4	8
Unit 5	9
Unit 6	13
Unit 7	15
Unit 8	16

# **APPLIED BUSINESS**

## **General Certificate of Education**

**Summer 2014**

### **Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**

#### **Chief Examiner's Report**

(General overview by Chief Examiner, David Floyd)

#### **Traditionally examined units (ABUS 1 and ABUS 5)**

Centres are strongly advised to check the Principal Examiner's individual unit reports for further detail and clarification.

#### **Approach to traditionally examined units**

In general, the approach of candidates to ABUS 1 and ABUS 5 was appropriate because centres are clearly aware that this is an 'applied' qualification. Once again, however, a number of candidates failed to use the business context provided when answering certain questions.

This series, when answering questions, far fewer candidates keyed in/copied out the question wording. It is not really necessary to do this and is a waste of valuable examination time. However, a disappointingly high number of candidates attempted more than the two required sections when sitting ABUS 5. This is again a waste of examination time.

Some candidates still submitted their scripts in hard copy rather than electronic format. Whilst this is sometimes necessary for technical reasons, the hard copy format is designed to be used solely in such circumstances.

#### **Performance in traditionally examined units**

The ABUS 1 paper produced the normal range of answers, from well applied and factually correct ones through to non-applied/theoretical ones, that often contained inaccurate or incomplete information. The candidate performance in the 'extended answer' questions was slightly better this year than in the previous summer series. The ABUS 5 paper presented its usual difficulties to many candidates, often in terms of a lack of content knowledge. Marketing and Production remained the most popular sections.

#### **Moderated units (ABUS 2 - 4, ABUS 6 - 8)**

Centres are strongly advised to check the Principal Moderator's individual unit reports for further detail and clarification.

#### **Administration of moderated units**

In general, the centres carried out administration appropriately. Deadlines were typically kept to, and communication of information to moderators was normally clear and acceptably concise. In terms of form completion, there was little evidence of omitting candidate signatures (or names keyed in), which is a requirement in order to confirm that the work submitted was that of the candidate. Although work was generally submitted in electronic format, as required, some hard copy was once again received.

## **Approach to moderated units**

In general, the approach to these units was suitable.

The lack of 'business feel' and structure in ABUS 6 was less of an issue this series. A business plan is required for this unit; however, what is still sometimes being submitted – whilst containing content relevant to a business plan to be submitted to a potential lender of finance – was not in a format that would be expected by such a lender.

The work for this unit from 2012 onwards has been in the format of a business plan, as follows:

- no more than 20 pages (A4)
- structured appropriately (for example, by using the ABUS 6 assignment guidance sheet headings)
- supported by appendices that clarify, provide evidence for, and support the comments and points made in the plan itself by charts, diagrams, tables, other summaries, research results and whatever else is necessary

The core AS unit, ABUS 2, was generally well done, though there remains the occasional centre that fails to get candidates undertaking primary research, which is fundamental to the successful completion of this work.

## **Annotation and assessment of moderated units**

In general, annotation was adequate, and sometimes very clear and detailed. Centres adopted different approaches: for example, some indicated mark band achievement at the point of achievement in the body of the work by utilising the comments facility; some submitted their own 'feedback' forms in addition to the WJEC form; others limited their comments to the WJEC form. Because it is a requirement that annotation should indicate where the assessment criteria have been met, indicate any planning and processing not undertaken individually and provide details of any assistance given to the candidates, the last approach – the WJEC form being completed and submitted on its own without additional comment – is arguably the least 'good' approach, being least helpful for undertaking moderation.

In general, the centre marks corresponded with those of the moderators. Assessment criteria were applied appropriately – though often slightly generously (but within tolerance) – and the correct mark band was usually identified. The overall performance was good, and centres and candidates should be commended on their hard work.

# APPLIED BUSINESS

## General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

#### Unit 1: INVESTIGATING BUSINESS AND FINANCE

*Principal Examiner:* David Floyd

The Unit 1 examination paper contains a scenario supported by a number of avatars that give additional information, followed by a range of short-answer and extended questions. Centres are familiar with the specification content and assessment requirements through activities such as following CPD/training advice and accessing past series' papers.

#### **General performance**

The context of this paper was LoudSound Media Holdings (LMH) Ltd, a commercial radio group that owns four stations broadcasting from three locations. The paper proved accessible: many candidates used the context appropriately, although the requirement to answer 'applied' questions plus the wide-ranging unit content presented the usual challenges.

#### **Performance by questions/question groups**

##### **Section A**

This section was reasonably well answered by most candidates, though few gained near-maximum marks. The first six questions were objective type. In the traditional multiple choice section (questions 1-5), candidates found question 2 particularly difficult, with many believing that non-current (fixed) assets form part of working capital. Question 6 was a matching type and was usually very well answered, many candidates gaining full marks by categorising accurately each of the six costs as fixed or variable.

Questions 7 and 8 were non-objective. Question 7 was typically well answered, with candidates being able to provide accurate statements about the given sections of the business plan. Question 8 proved much more difficult. In (a), many candidates gained at least one mark by referring in general terms to the 'SMART' concept. Parts (b) and (c) answers were much weaker, with candidates usually ignoring the reference to 'these' business objectives in the question. As a result, answers tended to focus on the difference between qualitative and quantitative methods rather than on how business objectives based on selling advertising airtime to businesses might be monitored. This was the first example of where candidates failed to read a question with sufficient care and so did not apply the answer, or failed to follow question instructions. Centres are once again encouraged to continue working closely with their candidates on these aspects of exam technique.

## Section B

The questions in this section were grouped into four topic areas:

- 1 - 3 required a comparison with a business studied (15 marks)
- 4 - 6 had themes of roles/relationships, resources and quality (15 marks)
- 7 - 10 focused on budgeting (25 marks)
- 11 - 13 concentrated on finance, cash flow and liquidity (25 marks).

### *Questions 1 – 3*

This group of questions was typically very well answered. Past reports comment on the failure of some candidates to gain the mark for question 1 through not describing the named organisation, and this series was no exception to this. Candidates were expected to focus in question 2 on confidentiality in their chosen organisation, and many scored highly by referring typically to customer purchases/financial information, employee records, and the legal requirements relating to data protection. A few candidates, however, mistook 'confidential' for 'confident' and so centres are again encouraged to continue working with their candidates on the need to study the question wording very carefully.

Question 3 was based on entrepreneurial skills and attributes and was also well answered. The stronger candidates related their part (a) answers closely to LMH Ltd: for example, if referring to risk-taking by mentioning risks associated with establishing new programmes for the radio station's listeners. Part (b) was sometimes also well applied by, for example, reference to a car manufacturer's new hybrid model or a food manufacturer's new product line.

### *Questions 4 – 6*

These questions proved difficult for most candidates. Full marks for question 4 were rarely awarded because many candidates were content merely to list HR-related tasks instead of recognising that the HR manager's workload is likely to have increased, together with the likely need to retrain existing staff and/or employ new staff with possibly different skills.

Question 5 was not well answered. The question was based on the reality that a company's objectives are likely to require some ranking/prioritising. The stronger answers recognised that the new radio station would benefit in the medium term by first seeking to establish a reasonable audience size at the (short-term) cost of lower advertising revenue: once audience loyalty is built, advertising revenue can be increased.

Question 6 was expected to be a straightforward one. Those candidates who knew the topic gained good marks – although a surprising number were not aware of quality circles – and the better answers acknowledged the phrase 'this situation' in the question by, for example, recognising the newness of the radio station.

### *Questions 7 – 10*

These questions produced a wide-ranging quality of answers. Many candidates gained at least one of the two marks available for question 7 by typically referring to the control, monitoring and/or motivational benefits of budgeting. Question 8 caused more difficulty. Many candidates failed to understand that a revenue budget does not include costs, whilst others did not acknowledge that this company's main revenue stream appears to come from broadcast advertisements and so their answers were not well applied.

Question 9 introduced calculations, and many candidates gained all five marks in (a) by calculating accurately the budgeted figures and overall variance. There remains, however, some confusion as to whether a variance is favourable or adverse. Part (b) was sometimes very well answered. Many candidates gained three marks by stating the three single variance results though far fewer were able to give the specific reasons why these variances occurred. Stronger candidates could calculate that the presenters were receiving a higher hourly rate and that the part-time employees had worked four extra hours: few went on to explain that the nil variance for full-time staff was due to their receiving a fixed salary (an apparent fixed cost).

Marks were missed in question 10 as a result of many candidates not incorporating references to specific budgets in their answers. Many used PESTLE appropriately to identify likely changes in the external environment – a change in the national minimum wage was the most popular change – but few then developed their answers by clear reference to the effect on the company's costs/revenues and the related effect on relevant budgets.

### *Questions 11 – 13*

These questions were well answered in total, though many candidates relied heavily for good marks here on an accurate cash flow forecast. Question 11 was often not well answered because candidates failed to develop their points, particularly when referring to a 'bank loan'. There was a general lack of clarity (for example, as to the length of the bank loan), together with a lack of reasoning as to why the suggested finance source was suitable: likely reasons for suitability such as an overdraft's flexibility or a loan's known costs (for budgeting/forecasting) were rarely given. Answers containing no more than the terms 'quick' and 'easy' do not gain marks.

Questions 12 and 13 were based on financial calculations and the concept of liquidity. Many candidates scored well on question 12, typically following the required layout (N.B: those who started their cash flow forecast with the opening balances typically made errors in calculating the net cash flow). The delayed receipts/payments were a discriminator here as expected but, in general, candidates appear to be reasonably comfortable with this topic. Question 13 was much more challenging. Once again the confusion between profit and cash was widely noted, with many candidates referring in their answers to 'profit' rather than to cash flows. The stronger candidates were able to identify and comment on the continuing net outflow of cash whilst acknowledging that this net outflow was itself falling in size and, when compared to the cash balances, was not of immediate significance. Few candidates, however, commented on the fact that this is a forecast only and therefore has its limitations in terms of accuracy.

# **APPLIED BUSINESS**

## **General Certificate of Education**

**Summer 2014**

### **Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**

#### **Unit 2: INVESTIGATING BUSINESS INFLUENCES AND ACTIVITIES**

*Principal Moderator:* David Floyd

#### **Administration and annotation**

This series, centres again normally carried out administration satisfactorily with candidates' portfolios being received on time. Most portfolios were submitted via CD or USB, with the candidates' names and marks often being summarised on an accompanying sheet, which was helpful. A small minority of centres again submitted portfolios as hard copy, and are again asked to switch to electronic submission in the future.

Centres provided annotation in various ways: either on the WJEC forms; in the body of work itself; or on their own forms (or sometimes a combination of these). Annotation is important to assist moderators in their task, and appropriately detailed annotation was normally made.

#### **Task completion**

Some centres combined tasks (normally the second and third), which is acceptable. A small minority of centres allowed their candidates to concentrate largely or exclusively on secondary research, rather than provide a mix of both primary and secondary. These centres are strongly encouraged to review their approach to portfolio construction and completion in view of ABUS 2 coursework being investigative by nature, which therefore suggests that primary research will normally have a key role to play.

#### **Assessment**

Centres normally assessed their candidates' work at an appropriate standard, though again there was often some slight generosity, it was within the tolerance allowed.

# APPLIED BUSINESS

## General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

#### Unit 3: INVESTIGATING HOW CUSTOMER NEEDS ARE MET

*Principal Moderator:* Lynne Williams

#### **Controlled Assignment Focus**

The focus of this assignment was Cineworld cinemas. The scenario put candidates in the role of Assistant to the Operations Manager in the location of their choice. They were given three tasks to complete in this role.

#### **Administration**

Centres generally carried out administration efficiently and met the deadline set for this unit. Different electronic media – CDs and memory sticks – were again used but some centres sent the work in hard copy. It is hoped that all future work can be submitted on CD/memory stick unless otherwise requested/agreed.

All candidates had structured the assignment by task. In the main, portfolios were clear and easy to follow and this greatly helped the moderation process. The standard of written communication was good, and there was appropriate use of business terms and concepts.

#### **Assessment**

In general, the centre marks corresponded with those of the moderators. All were within tolerance. Assessment criteria were applied appropriately and the correct mark band was usually identified. The overall performance was good, with candidates scoring well across all tasks. Candidates had applied their knowledge to the given scenarios and there was little reliance on text-book theory.

Candidates should be commended on their hard work this series.

# APPLIED BUSINESS

## General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

#### Unit 4: INVESTIGATING A BUSINESS'S ICT PROVISION

*Principal Moderator:* David Floyd

#### **Administration and annotation**

Centres normally carried out administration satisfactorily and so most portfolios were received by the due date. The names and marks of the sample were usually summarised on an accompanying sheet.

Centres provided annotation in various ways: on the WJEC forms; and/or on the body of work itself; and/or via their own forms. Annotation is important to assist moderators in their task, and appropriate annotation was made in this series.

#### **Task completion**

The tasks were constructed and submitted separately in the portfolios. Task completion was generally good, with a suitable range of software being used. Candidates were able to follow the task requirements and often displayed good understanding of the work of the chosen garages.

#### **Assessment**

Centres generally assessed their candidates' work at an appropriate standard, and no adjustments had to be made.

**APPLIED BUSINESS**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**Summer 2014**  
**Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**  
**Unit 5: BUSINESS DECISION-MAKING**

*Principal Examiner:* David Floyd

### **Introduction**

This was the fifth summer series Unit 5 paper. It is in four parts, each of which focuses on a specification section and has its own avatar statement, giving information in a style similar to that of Unit 1. Questions total 40 marks, sections being based on sub-topics worth 20 marks each, and so, in effect, candidates answer four multi-part 20-mark questions. The paper starts with a general scenario, this series featuring *InsectAside plc*, a manufacturer of pesticides and related products.

**NB1:** each specification section is itself separated into four separate subject areas. In this examination, questions were set on (at least) two of these four subject areas for each section. **Centres must not anticipate** that, if an individual subject area has been examined in a particular series, it cannot therefore be examined in the following series.

**NB2:** some candidates still attempt more than the two sections required by the examination. Whilst there is no direct penalty for so doing, candidates obviously penalise themselves by wasting valuable examination time answering (far) more questions than are required. Centres are once again asked to continue working with their candidates to ensure that they focus their limited time on two sections only.

### **General performance**

The *InsectAside plc* context proved accessible to candidates. Previous reports have mentioned that the nature of applied assessment sets challenges. There has been a gradual improvement over the course of this examination, though candidate performance in this series once again illustrated the extremes: detailed business knowledge, together with an ability to use the context appropriately, compared to limited understanding accompanied by an inability (or unwillingness) to contextualise points made.

Because the subject is 'applied' business, marks continue to be lost through non-application of business content to the given situation. Centres are therefore encouraged to continue asking candidates to practise interpreting the scenario and information in order to apply their general business knowledge and understanding.

## Performance by sections and questions/question groups

### Section A

#### *Questions 1 - 3 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on market research terms and the 'Boston Box', and were quite well answered. Question 1 produced a range of answers, with weaker candidates relying on mere repetition of the question terms in their answers, which in itself does not generate marks: other candidates were able to offer accurate descriptions, sometimes supported with valid examples. The most challenging term tended to be "panel surveys". Question 2 was typically very well answered, with many candidates gaining all four marks for knowing the correct classifications for the product ranges given in the question. Occasionally, a candidate would name 'problem child' ('question mark') and 'dog', without quoting relevant evidence as requested but, in general, candidates read the question carefully and followed its requirements.

Question 3 was often not well answered. As an "Assess the extent" question, accompanied by the word "this" in bold, a balanced and contextualised answer was looked for. The stronger candidates referred to 'green' pesticides and/or the BCG classifications (from question 2) in their answers, commenting on issues such as how the business is encouraged to define the pesticide range's market share and growth, and the relevance of the new range being presently classified as a 'question mark'. These points would then be balanced by a discussion of the BCG Matrix's limitations by, for example, referring to the difficulty of defining market share or the lack of a guarantee of profitability even if market share increases.

#### *Questions 4 - 6 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on sales forecasting. Similar questions to 4 and 5 have been set before so many candidates knew – to a certain extent – what to look for. As a result, in question 4, the stronger candidates identified not only the simple trends (rising and falling) but also the rate of change, together with calculations to justify their comments. In question 5, the out-of-date limitation of the figures was often commented on. Stronger candidates identified other limitations such as the lack of information on source and sample size/location, the fact that garden sizes were estimated, and the use of percentages rather than raw numbers. Some candidates did not read the question with sufficient care (for example, ignoring the word "limitations") and therefore wrote misdirected answers.

Question 6 required candidates to "examine" in a given context (employment and investment). Many struggled to apply their answers other than by the simplest of links, but still gained some marks for doing so. Stronger answers referred to specifics of investment and/or employment in the context of forecasting, typically acknowledging that major financial decisions – based solely on forecasts that are likely to prove inaccurate – carry risk.

### Section B

#### *Questions 1 - 4 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on new product development and on stock control. Question 1 was based on stages in new product development, candidates being given a choice of answering two from three. Candidates tended either to know or not know the answers, with a number guessing at "business analysis" in particular. Question 2 was reasonably well answered, with most candidates being able to explain – often using examples to support their explanation – the likely impacts on the purchasing and HR functions. However, some candidates were confused as to the nature of HR which, at this stage of their studies, is rather surprising.

Question 3 tested the calculation of EOQ. It was not substantially different from previous questions in that the numerical information required some initial adjustment – in this case, converting litre volume into container size, and monthly information into its annual equivalent – which some candidates found challenging. EOQ calculations were often inaccurate, though candidates frequently gained some marks for part-correct calculations and procedure. Question 4 was based on stockholding and many candidates gained full marks for this very straightforward question.

#### *Questions 5 - 7 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on (batch) production methods and external economies of scale. Candidates' answers varied greatly in quality, with many gaining low marks. In question 5, many candidates struggled in (a) to give concise answers to the meaning of batch production, and in (b) to apply their knowledge of batch production to the given context. There was a surprising degree of confusion between job and flow methods in question 6, although the stronger candidates were able to identify key drawbacks of flow (such as its typically high capital cost) to support their comments on the advantages of batch in this situation, often making relevant points about it being a new product range.

Question 7 was poorly answered. Many candidates ignored the importance of the words "pesticide" and "manufacturers": they therefore argued that there were no other manufacturers located near the factory, which is not stated in the question, and/or made points based on the business selling directly to the local population, which is highly unlikely for such a manufacturer. Better answers focused on points such as the poor reputation of a competitor not having a negative effect because it is not located nearby, and the drawbacks of having no external economies such as a local pool of skilled labour.

### **Section C**

#### *Questions 1 - 3 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on flexible budgeting and marginal costing (contribution analysis), and produced answers varying greatly in quality and accuracy. Question 1 tested candidates on their ability to 'flex' a budget. Some did so accurately, though many failed to adapt the budget's variable cost figures. Marks were protected in question 2 through the 'own figure' rule, and were available both for simple statements about the variances and for stating likely reasons. Many candidates did well here by showing detailed knowledge about the nature of specific variances.

Question 3 was generally not well answered. Some candidates gained the occasional mark for demonstrating some knowledge of contribution analysis; however, only a few were able to explain adequately that apparently 'unprofitable' products might still generate a positive contribution towards fixed costs.

#### *Questions 4 - 6 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on ratio analysis and allied concepts and were often well answered. Question 4 asked candidates to explain key financial terms, and – as is often the case with such questions – candidates either knew the answer or resorted to guessing. Asset turnover proved particularly difficult for many. Those who knew the meaning of 'gearing' in this question were usually able to gain most of the marks for question 5, which tested their knowledge of its importance. However, a number failed to follow the question's requirement to use information from the given memo, which contained gearing ratios for three suppliers to the business, and therefore lost marks.

Question 6 focused candidates' attention on the memo information, asking them to review the comparative performance of the three suppliers. Many candidates gave full and detailed answers, gaining most or all of the marks, though, surprisingly, only a few acknowledged the limitations of relying solely on this information when making judgements. Better answers were often organised into liquidity, profitability and efficiency sections, which helped candidates produce strong arguments.

## **Section D**

### *Questions 1 -3 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on discounted cash flow and were often not well answered. Question 1 proved testing to some, even though the understanding that future cash flows are worth less than present ones was often shown. Question 2 presented the typical dilemma to candidates of whether the financial information needed some further work: there was often a lack of understanding that the NPV calculation is based on cash flow rather than on profits, and so the information was not adjusted. (Marks were protected in question 3 by operation of the 'own figure' rule.)

Question 3 was quite well answered, with candidates typically making accurate statements based on their workings, together with showing an understanding of typical qualitative factors associated with the limitations of discounted cash flow analysis. However, some ignored the term "qualitative" in the question and therefore lost marks needlessly.

### *Questions 4 - 7 (20 marks)*

These questions were based on Gantt charts and decision trees and were reasonably well answered. Question 4 produced answers of varying quality, with the better candidates contextualising their points by referring to the shop building. Calculations to question 5 were often part-accurate, where candidates stated the costs but failed to complete calculations of revenues. However, most were able to make an accurate judgement based on their calculations when answering question 6.

Answers to question 7 sometimes lacked balance – this was an "assess"-style question – and/or failed to focus on "this" decision as required, and so comments about decision trees were sometimes limited to basic 'textbook'-type information.

## APPLIED BUSINESS

### General Certificate of Education

Summer 2014

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

### Unit 6: BUSINESS PLANNING

*Principal Moderator:* Lynne Williams

#### Digital Portfolio Focus

Candidates were tasked to write a realistic business plan to gain additional funding of £10,000 for the opening of a new small business in their local area. Their attention was directed to an article on the Internet at [www.telegraph.co.uk](http://www.telegraph.co.uk) entitled “**Starting a business: young entrepreneurs are vital to Britain's economy**” and to the gov.uk website <https://www.gov.uk/browse/business/setting-up>.

#### Administration

Centres generally carried out administration efficiently and met the deadline set for this unit. Different electronic media – CDs and memory sticks – were again used but many of the centres sent the work in hard copy. It is hoped that all future work can be submitted on CD/memory stick unless otherwise requested/agreed.

Most candidates had structured the assignment by task. In the main, portfolios were clear and easy to follow and this greatly helped with the moderation process. The standard of written communication was good, and there was appropriate use of business terms and concepts.

A range of excellent portfolios was submitted, showing a variety of business ideas that were well supported by both primary and secondary research. The standard of written communication was good, and there was appropriate use of business terms and concepts.

Plans submitted this series were mostly realistic. Most candidates had thought their ideas through thoroughly to ensure that they were realistic, but some struggled with their financial projections which were rather optimistic.

It was good to see far fewer problems in the length of the document submitted. The instructions state that ‘the plan should be concise and professional and not be more than 20 pages long, excluding the appendix and financial documents’. It has been recommended in previous reports that candidates structure their work so that their business plan is much briefer and succinct, thus making it more suitable for submission to ‘the potential lender of finance’. No business plan for an external lender should run to more than 15 to 20 pages. Appendices to support the plan, providing suitable support for the text through charts, diagrams, research, etc were well used.

#### Assessment

In general, the centre marks corresponded with those of the moderators although some had been marked a little generously. Assessment criteria were applied appropriately and the correct mark band was usually identified. The overall performance was good and centres and candidates should be commended on their hard work.

## **APPLIED BUSINESS**

### **General Certificate of Education**

**Summer 2014**

### **Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**

## **Unit 7: MANAGING BUSINESSES IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT**

*Principal Moderator:* Lynne Williams

### **Controlled Assignment Focus**

Candidates were asked to demonstrate their knowledge of business in an international context by carrying out three separate tasks.

### **Administration**

Centres generally carried out administration efficiently and met the deadline set for this unit. Different electronic media – CDs and memory sticks – were again used but some centres sent the work in hard copy. It is hoped that all future work can be submitted on CD/memory stick unless otherwise requested/agreed.

Although candidates seem to find this unit more difficult, most dealt well with the demands of each task, submitting well prepared PowerPoint presentations and reports that were fit for purpose and appropriate for and accessible to the given audience. They carried out thorough research, and used this research to inform their submissions with charts and graphs. Comprehensive speaker notes accompanied the PowerPoint slides for Task 1 but there was still a great deal of information to read on each slide. For future cohorts, candidates should be encouraged to present less text on each slide and more in the speaker notes. The speaker notes could be produced in Word if this proves easier for the candidate.

Overall, the standard of written communication was good, and there was appropriate use of business terms and concepts.

### **Assessment**

In general, the centre marks corresponded with those of the moderators. All were within tolerance. Assessment criteria were applied appropriately and the correct mark band was usually identified. The overall performance was good, with candidates scoring well across all tasks. Candidates had applied their knowledge to the given scenarios with little reliance on textbook theory.

**APPLIED BUSINESS**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**Summer 2014**  
**Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**  
**Unit 8: MANAGEMENT AND CHANGE**

*Principal Moderator:* Lynne Williams

**Virtual Work Experience Focus**

The focus of this assignment was based on management and change in the private and public sectors. Candidates were given four tasks to carry out whilst on 'virtual work experience'.

**Administration**

Centres generally carried out administration efficiently and met the deadline set for this unit. Different electronic media – CDs and memory sticks – were again used but some centres sent the work in hard copy. It is hoped that all future work can be submitted on CD/memory stick unless otherwise requested/agreed.

Most candidates looked at the private sector. All candidates had structured the assignment by task. Most portfolios were clear and easy to follow and this greatly helped the moderation process. The standard of written communication was good, and there was appropriate use of business terms and concepts. There was clear evidence of primary and secondary research throughout the work.

Candidates' work varied in standard, with some work being more in depth than others. Some candidates struggled to produce appropriately business-like responses and included unnecessary theory.

**Assessment**

Candidates scored well across all tasks and, in general, the centre marks corresponded with those of the moderators. Assessment criteria were applied appropriately and the correct mark band was usually identified. The overall performance was good and candidates had attempted to apply their knowledge to the given scenario although there was some reliance on text-book theory in some portfolios. On occasions, candidates had not fully geared their presentations to the correct audience.

The overall performance was good and centres and candidates should be commended on their hard work.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)