



General Certificate of Education

Applied Business 8616/8619

BS12 Managing People

Report on the Examination

2007 examination - January series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

General Comments

This examination was successful in assessing candidates' abilities in the subject area. The marking scheme performed well and clearly discriminated between candidates.

Some centres are teaching this unit very well, with most candidates able to tackle the full range of the specification. In these centres the candidates have also been clearly taught to analyse and develop their answers.

However, it was disappointing that, in several cases, centres were not aware of some key subject areas which are in the specification. This suggests that some candidates are not being taught the full syllabus in sufficient depth to be able to apply their knowledge within this 'applied' examination. This was true of areas such as proactive management, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, where centres failed to use the correct terminology or theoretical underpinnings.

Candidates were generally satisfactory in their use of trigger words in the questions to ensure their answers were focused on the actual question posed. However, many candidates simply produced lists of points which did not allow a full development of their answers. In particular, in several questions candidates were asked to select and explain one point or idea, but many candidates instead of fully developing one idea talked about three or more in only scant detail. Inevitably, this affects candidates ability to score well in a levels of response based mark scheme.

Virtually all candidates completed the paper in the time allocated. For those candidates who did not manage this it appears to be have been subject knowledge gaps rather than time which defeated them.

Question One

- (a) Most candidates identified a management role and described it although some responses were about management styles rather than roles.
- (b)(i) Most candidates were clearly able to explain why Josef had lacked authority with the better candidates relating this to a variety of factors which were clearly explained using sound theoretical underpinnings.
 - (ii) It was pleasing that most candidates demonstrated a clear understanding that the impact of Mark's intervention on Josef's authority would not be clear cut, and that there may be a difference between the short and long-term. Some answers were very mature and demonstrated a sound understanding of the problems in establishing authority.
- (c) This question was answered well at a basic level by virtually all candidates. However, too many candidates ignored the instruction in the question to only identify 'one' advantage and 'one' disadvantage and either only looked at one issue, or looked at many unrelated issues all of which were poorly developed. For higher marks they had to demonstrate the ability to explain, analyse and discuss.

Question Two

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified the type of decision which needed to be made although fewer were able to explain it within the context of the item which was needed for higher marks to be awarded.
- (b)(i) Many candidates answered this question in a very generic way and few really explained how Maslow could be used to assess their motivation. Some candidates were also confused by the levels within Maslow and incorrectly applied them to the position in the business. Some did not seem to understand what Maslow was or did not use any of the Hierarchy of Needs within their answer – this inevitably scored badly as it did not answer the question set.
- (ii) As with part (i) the main weakness was the lack of reference to the Hierarchy of Needs in an applied sense, although, in general, marks were slightly higher on this question than for part (i).
- (c) This question acted as a good discriminator, and whilst most candidates gave a basic level 1 or 2 answer, a few were able to develop their answer fully. In relation to AO4 marks it is disappointing how many candidates failed to relate their answer to the question's request to 'select and justify', with many not selecting any particular approach, but instead producing a very general discussion of lots of options without attempting to conclude or make a recommendation.

Question Three

- (a) Most candidates gave a basic explanation of what proactive meant but few related this in detail to the situation facing the business.
- (b)(i) Most candidates made a good attempt at this question and were able to use Herzberg to analyse the impact on the drivers of the changes proposed. However, some candidates did not know what Herzberg was or used an alternative theory and thus failed to answer the question set.
- (ii) Virtually all candidates were able to explain the basic way in which Nasser's leadership style would need to change. This question acted as a good discriminator in that more able candidates went on to clearly relate this to the item and the situation faced in the business.
- (c) It was pleasing that most candidates were able to make a good attempt at the issues this question covered. Weaker candidates simply looked at the likely changes in the drivers' motivation, whilst the more able candidates developed their answers to relate the changes to the impact on the success of the business.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.