

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2010

GCE

GCE Applied Business (6922) 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.

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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **[Economics and Business]** telephone line: **[0207 190 5329]**

January 2010

Publications Code UA023103

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

PM Report on coursework paper 6922/01 - Investigating Enterprise - January 2010

General Comments

This is a practical unit and the Enterprise must actually run for a period of time and candidates need to provide evidence for all stages of the Enterprise, from the planning stage through to the winding up of the business. Group size is an issue that Centres should pay attention to. If teams are too large candidates are often unable to show significant contribution to the enterprise which is particularly important to achieve marks at Mark Band 2 and Mark Band 3 level.

Areas of the Specification

This unit had one of the smallest entries. This is probably due to the need to run an enterprise over time that requires substantial work commitment outside lesson time.

Strand (a)

Candidates are expected to show evidence of their participation in the planning, launch and running of the business. This is often in the form of diaries/journals. However, these were often very sparse in detail. By keeping very detailed diaries/journals, candidates do have the opportunity to fully outline their own involvement and much of the evidence for candidate involvement comes from the diaries. Diaries also show timelines and make activities clear. They support the other three strands.

However, candidates often appear to be reluctant to emphasise their input and the use of 'we' is often evident in the diaries/journals. Candidates should also include a personal evaluation. These were often unsubstantiated or, in many cases, were simply a description of what they did and did not evaluate performance. A witness statement from the assessor may support this.

The centre has to ensure that the product/service of the company involves sufficient activity to enable all candidates to have an active input to enable them to move out of mark band 1. A number of centres set up companies to run events or trips but these were often small, one-off events and were too small to allow candidates to fully cover the assessment criteria beyond Mark Band 1. Where the events are quite substantial and involve a number of different activities, candidates are able to provide sufficient evidence. However, in the case of one centre, the activity involved a lunchtime activity in school which is far too small an event. The candidates in these centres experienced difficulty in providing evidence of primary research and evidence for other strands. A substantive business activity is required.

Strand (b)

Some candidates produced excellent work for this strand with clear descriptions of roles and responsibilities as well as supported evaluations of team members in these roles. Other candidates failed to produce either the descriptions or evaluations. There was little detail or underlying theory presented in the work from a number of candidates making it difficult to move out of mark band 1.

Strand (c)

The witness statements for the presentation were often brief and needed much greater detail. Where clear and detailed witness statements showing substantive contribution were present, centres could move candidates into mark band 3. This does, however, need supporting evidence from candidates showing originality of thought and outstanding contribution to the group report and presentation. In most portfolios, where there is a strong witness statement identifying strong and sustained contribution to the running of the company, the group activity and the group presentation by the candidate there was usually sufficient candidate evidence to support the allocation of higher marks. However, some centres are still submitting strong witness statements and awarding high marks without the supporting evidence in the candidates' portfolios.

Where role or contribution was minor it was extremely difficult for candidates to move outside mark band 1. Candidates also should include their own PowerPoint printouts, cue cards, etc. The centre must also ensure that a full copy of the group presentation is sent for moderation to enable individual input to be gauged. The centres should not restrict themselves to the one side of the exemplar witness statement proforma found in the qualification guidance and on the Edexcel website. This is only a guide and centres must ensure that they make full and clear statements about candidate input into the company and the presentation. Where the activity/event was too small candidates could not generate sufficient evidence. Where a company report is produced as well as the individual portfolios, this must be sent with the sample.

Strand (d)

This strand needs the financial outcomes of the company to be used to enable effective evaluations. This did not always happen. Some centres did not direct candidates to cover this strand as a separate task and relied upon descriptions of activities and the personal evaluations and the evaluations of the other team members to be the evaluation of the company. Evaluation was often limited to making a profit.

This strand needs to be addressed as a separate task and solely concentrate on the enterprise as a whole. To achieve higher mark bands, candidates need to show they are able to make justified conclusions and recommendations.

Comments on Administrative Procedures

Portfolios were largely received on time. Administration was generally good. Statements of authentication were present in most of the samples moderated for this series.

Assessment was generally consistent with some evidence of leniency, especially in the work of weaker candidates.

More centres submitted work suitably presented enabling easy access for moderation. However, some centres are still sending work in tightly packed, flimsy plastic wallets that often tear when trying to access the work for moderation.

Annotation of Portfolio Work

Annotation of the work still varies from indicating fully where the criteria has been met, to being very limited with little more than the final mark given. Annotation is best indicated via the Mark Band achieved and the area of specification met, e.g. MB1a indicates strand (a) has met Mark Band 1, rather than trying to annotate via the Assessment Objectives (AO's) as these are spread throughout the unit's strands.

Grade Boundaries - January 2010

6922	Total	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Mark	60	49	43	37	32	27
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40

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

Order Code UA023103 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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