

# **Business Studies**

Advanced GCE A2 7811

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3811

## **Report on the Units**

---

**January 2009**

**3811/7811/MS/R/09J**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE Business Studies (7811)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Business Studies (3811)

#### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner Report	1
2871: Businesses, their Objectives and Environment	2
2872: Business Decisions	5
2873: Business Behaviour	7
2874: Further Marketing	10
2875: Further Accounting and Finance	12
2876: Further People in Organisations	14
2877: Further Operations Management	16
2878: Business Project	18
2879: The Business Thematic Enquiry	20
2880: Business Strategy	22
Grade Thresholds	25

## **Chief Examiner Report**

Colleagues in centres will, by now, be aware that the six unit 3811/7811 specifications are being replaced by the new four unit H030/H430 specifications. Indeed, current Year 12 learners should soon be coming to the end of the AS component (H030) of their two year A level course (H430). Indeed, some will have already been entered for, and been assessed on, units F291 and F292.

In this transition period between the specifications, all of the 'legacy' specification A2 units will be available for assessment in both January and June 2010.

As ever, the individual Principal Examiner Reports in this booklet are commended to colleagues. The underlying philosophy of OCR Business Studies remains; it is simply transferred from the legacy specification to the new. Hence, whilst these comments relate to the legacy specification, they have currency and relevance for the new.

Previously, the inability of candidates to use and gain marks on any question which required number was seen as a significant concern for the examining team. Happily, script evidence suggests that candidates are improving in this vital aspect of Business Studies. However, a new concern is growing to take the place of 'number'; the legibility of handwriting. Although it may sound trite, if the writing is so poor that sentences need reading several times to glean meaning, candidates are ill equipped when trying to present a coherent, logically argued, answer. Within the legacy specification, quality of written communication attracted its own specific marks. In the new specification, however, the marks are now embedded into the mark descriptors of identified questions. Hence, the importance of being able to communicate effectively with the examiner continues to be important.

In an era of increased assessment transparency such as published mark schemes and grade boundaries, Examiner Reports and the ability to recall scripts post results it might be tempting to think that the benefits of being an examiner are diminished. To some extent this may be true. However, being an examiner remains the best way, by far, of understanding the assessment process. This enhanced understanding can then be translated into more effective classroom practice to the benefit of the learners.

# 2871: Businesses, their Objectives and Environment

## General Comments

The main issue within candidate responses was with the quality of written communication; spelling and presentation remain a major concern. A large number of candidates presented their work in a frankly atrocious manner and adopted a “you decipher this” attitude. Alternatively, some wrote in such large spidery letters that they only managed around four or even three words per line. A lack of paragraphs did not help matters either. These points have been mentioned before. Examiners do try to give the benefit of the doubt to candidates but some scripts were in part unreadable.

Where writing is extremely poor – for whatever reason – centres are advised to speak to their Examinations’ Officer to seek guidance on whether the use of a word processor might be appropriate.

## Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 This question had never been asked before but most candidates were certainly able to answer with little difficulty. Answers did not have to be in the context of KPL. The most obvious way an investor might benefit is through a rise in the value of the shares and the payment of a dividend. Answers which dealt with “...having a say/vote...” in the direction of the company were also valid – as were “...trying to gain control of the company...” or “...asset stripping...” but these were fairly few and far between.

The question did, however, highlight the importance of being precise when answering. “...they might make money...” is not the sort of response which gained a mark whereas “...they hope to get a dividend...” was.

- 2 This standard question proved to be four straight-forward marks for those who knew the basics of business classification. The most common mistakes here were, the seemingly intractable problem of the confusion between ‘public company’ and ‘public enterprise’, the (odd) supposition that shareholders in public companies have limited liability, whereas those in a private company do not, and the failure to outline the differences as asked in the question. For Level 2 the difference had to be made clear. A statement such as “...in a plc the shares are on the Stock Exchange...” was, therefore, only Level 1 because of a failure to outline the difference.

- 3 In January, this was a highly topical issue for those with an interest in Business Studies. It soon became obvious when marking this question that candidates who had ‘kept an eye on the real world’ were much better placed to answer than those who did not. A large number, unfortunately, got the effects of a fall in the rate the wrong way round. Although ‘the exchange rate’ has moved onto the A2 part of the new specification, on Unit 2871 candidates should have been aware of the effects of a fall in the value of the pound.

For KPL this meant (in foreign currency terms) Rachael’s design services are now cheaper and so, theoretically, this would mean more sales abroad. However, the fall in the rate will mean that the imported paper the business uses has now become more expensive. Many candidates rightly suggested that Chris should now seek an alternative domestic supplier. There was also some sensible comment as to whether KPL’s prices could, and should, be raised to maintain profit margins.

The best candidates pointed out that the effect of an exchange rate change on KPL depends on factors such as the amount of design work Rachael does abroad (would a fall in the rate bring a major increase?) and the value of the paper imported by Chris. Also whether the fall in the rate is temporary or permanent and whether the rate change is large or small. Analysis along these lines scored full marks.

- 4 This was a question which discriminated well. Weaker candidates simply listed the sources of finance which a business can try to access with little attempt to put these into the context of KPL and the ADP contract; these answers were never going to score highly.

More able candidates gave thought to issues such as Rachael and Chris investing more money in the form of shares from their own funds or making a personal loan to their company or issuing more shares to others - only £3700 of the authorised £30,000 has been accessed so far. Answers taking this route were strengthened by comments about the likelihood of this given their previous experience of trying and/or their relatively short track record. Answers suggesting that KPL "...go public..." were not acceptable; these suggestions were not realistic for a business in KPL's position and showed a lack of understanding of the nature of a public company.

There were plenty of other routes to explore and evaluate, eg an overdraft – although many rightly pointed out that these are really for short-term (cash flow) use rather than long-term growth. Another loan from the bank was another option - but would this be forthcoming given the existing loan? The use of hire purchase/leasing was another possibility and would mean that KPL would not have to find all the money 'at once' although it could end up with KPL paying more for any capital equipment than if it was bought outright. All of these were considered well in the main and centres have clearly taught this section of the specification well. It was pleasing to see many comments being related to the 'real world' situation of the UK economy.

"...the government..." was also a possibility; KPL is in an area which qualifies for assistance. This assistance, if forthcoming, would obviously reduce the amount to be raised by other means. Better answers recognised that this assistance was not going to be 'a no strings attached bag of cash'.

As ever, with the 'higher mark questions' on this paper it was disappointing that many candidates produced some excellent analysis and then stopped short of a final evaluation as to which method(s) were the most appropriate and why. These answers scored 10/14 at the top of Level 3 and it was obvious that with a carefully considered relatively brief final paragraph they could easily have scored full/near full marks. This problem with examination technique has been a perennial concern of Examiners on Unit 2871 and remains a major reason why able candidates do not always fulfil their potential.

- 5 This question was not as well done as previous "business environment" questions. It was very important for candidates to bear in mind what this question was actually concerned with evaluating the influences likely to determine whether KPL successfully achieves the objective of growth through the AEP contract. Many candidates treated the question as if it had asked "Evaluate the factors that might affect KPL in the future" or "Evaluate the factors which might affect the operation of KPL". Answers such as this were highly likely to be tangential to the actual question set; it is important to read the question!

The question was interpreted in different ways by candidates and this was accepted and reflected how it was marked. Consideration could have been given to how successful completion of the contract might lead to growth via further orders with AEP in the future. Alternatively, how successful completion might lead to growth via good publicity to growth via orders from other firms similar to AEP. Some pointed out that the case made reference to KPL already having plenty of work and that if existing "bread and butter" customers were

neglected because of the AEP contract they may start using another printers – with the consequence that KPL would not be able to achieve its objective of growth from their custom. Essentially any reference to the consequences of successfully (and indeed unsuccessfully) fulfilling the contract on future growth received credit.

The question centered on Sections 1 (“What businesses need”) and/or 4 (“Planning”) and/or 6 (“Other influences”) of the specification. Possible issues for consideration from Section 1 were, therefore, (motivated) employees - are Kassim and Mandy ‘up to it’? (Reliable) Suppliers - can the right materials be obtained? Will suppliers meet deadlines? etc. As has been made clear before, a detailed knowledge of these issues is not necessary on this paper.

From Section 4, there is the ability of Rachael and Chris planning the steps to complete the contract and to liaise with the translators producing the text. There appears to be a problem with some of the translation (line 108). If this is true, then there is also the possibility of problems with the other translations and this could mean significant problems for them.

From Section 6, candidates could have considered technology; Chris says they will need new machinery for the contract. What are the training implications for Kassim and Mandy? Ethics were another consideration. If Chris ‘cuts corners’, ie dumping at the tip (line 112) and was caught, would AEP cancel the contract? If so, would bad publicity affect further orders and, therefore, growth?

This question proved a good discriminator between those who produced a list of ‘bullet point’ possible influences on KPL’s everyday operation (perhaps because this is what they had been prepared for) and those who carefully analysed several before reaching an evaluative conclusion.

## 2872: Business Decisions

### General Comments

There were a greater number of good scripts this series with many of the candidates successfully using the scenario to answer the questions. This allowed these candidates to achieve at least a Level 2 response. However, there remains a tendency to simply list factors rather than analysing the implications of those factors on the business. Therefore, the ability of the candidates to evaluate is inevitably hampered. This was particularly true of Question 3 where much time was spent on the theories of motivation, rather than how effective they were to the cabin crew. Overall candidates were able to apply knowledge and to use their experience of present financial conditions to inform responses and this added a new dimension to candidates' work. However, there were far too many instances of costs being confused with price and revenue with profit.

There was little evidence of candidates being unable to complete the paper in the time available and, on the whole, language skills were better than in previous sessions. Candidates, general, performed well on Question 2 although there were very few who used the calculation to help them to answer Question 2b. This restricts the ability of the candidate to properly analyse the issues in the question.

It is important with a paper of this length that candidates read the questions carefully and really take account of the command word. Even though time is short, pressure is eased if a few minutes are given over to thinking of the answer and how to construct it before putting pen to paper.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 This question was reasonably well answered with most candidates able to identify at least one financial issue. However, some candidates only suggested general issues such as training and recruitment and, therefore, gained little reward. Best answers identified issues such as sources of finance, investment appraisal, cash flow and costs. However, reward was limited if the only issue identified was, for example, a list of different costs.
- 2 (a) (i) Most candidates correctly calculated the average total revenue. It was encouraging to see a greater number of candidates showing their working; this enables those candidates that did not arrive at the correct answer to secure some marks.  
  
(ii) There were an encouraging number of candidates who calculated this percentage correctly and gained all the marks available.
- (b) This part of the question was reasonably well answered with many of the candidates exhibiting an in-depth understanding of the airline industry and especially the 'budget' sector the market. Once again, candidates used their knowledge of present economic circumstances to embellish their answers. The majority of candidates did achieve Level 3 analysis on this part of the question by discussing the implications of a decrease in prices on the seasonal activity of the airline. Many suggested that perhaps the loss in revenue from lowering prices might be compensated for by the increase in volume. The best answers discussed the implications of elasticity on this market. Judgements made were often based on the suggestion that lowering prices in the winter, when there was limited demand, would be better than lowering prices in the summer when demand was more predictable. Other candidates recognised that



in the present economic climate people might increase their use of budget airlines and, therefore, it would be detrimental to the business to lower prices.

- 3 Responses to this question fell into two camps. Those candidates who concentrated on applying theories of motivation to the list of motivating factors in the case and those who ignored reference to theories of motivation and concentrated on discussing the methods used and their likelihood of success. In both cases candidates found it difficult to achieve Level 3 because many ignored the context completely. Best answers identified that the majority of methods used by easyJet were monetary (Taylor) such as commission on in-flight sales which might motivate the crew members to sell more, thereby benefiting the company and the crew. Others suggested that easyJet addressed the lower levels of Maslow's hierarchy but failed to address the higher order needs. However, analysis such as this was rare and most candidates only achieved a Level 2 response on this question.
- 4 There was evidence in most of the answers that candidates did not really understand the concept of increased capacity in terms of an airline and less evidence that they were using it as a handle for the answer to the question. However, a number of candidates were able to use the context to analyse the implications of this growth to the business in terms of increased routes, more aircraft, bigger aircraft, economies of scale and problems of changing demand. Best answers attempted to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages in terms of whether investing in this extra capacity might be a good thing for the airline in the long term.

## 2873: Business Behaviour

### General Comments

The final January series for this unit saw entry numbers a little lower than normal, which was to be expected. The examining team felt that the case study was clear and well understood, as well as being accessible. A good proportion of candidates achieved Level 2 on all questions, but few were able to discuss and evaluate concepts, resorting to simply summarising the issues LTSL faced. There was no indication of candidates being short of time to complete the paper.

One approach which showed some promise was to contrast each method analysed with the previous method in terms of its importance, however, this only achieved evaluation if the contrast was based on the analysis rather than a subjective, unjustified opinion. Candidates who scored well made good use of the case study and used appropriate context to create a non-generic answer. Too often, candidates with a sound grasp of theory failed to access the higher level marks due to lack of application to the stimulus material in their responses – this was particularly true of Question 1(b).

Once again, there was some evidence of candidates not taking a calculator into the examination.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) (i) Many candidates achieved the correct answer, but common mistakes included just giving the total costs rather than the profit, subtracting £20,000 from £122,293 instead of adding it and adding £20,000 to £1,234,004. Many calculator errors were also seen; whilst some candidates gave a wrong final figure with no workings. Centres and candidates are reminded that no marks can be awarded for an answer that is wrong, if there is no working shown.
- (ii) Surprisingly, this part of the question was answered better than the previous part. Common mistakes, however, included subtracting 1% from £1,600,000 instead of 2% and calculating 2% to be £3,200 rather than £32,000 (generally by candidates who clearly did not have a calculator!) Other candidates were able to work out the actual revenue and actual costs, but failed to do the final subtraction. A final figure of £150,000 was also not uncommon.
- (b) Almost all candidates showed some knowledge and understanding of budgeting and were rewarded at Level 2 in this part of the question. Very many candidates showed detailed and impressive knowledge of the process and implications of budgeting, but did not apply this to the case material and hence, could only achieve a maximum of five marks. There was also some confusion with cash flow and investment appraisal.

Better answers were those which used Table 1 in their answer or other information from the case study, such as the need for LTSL to budget; it is expanding and thus important it controls expenditure in the different offices around the world. Other good answers included a realisation that budgets are only as good as the figures that go into them, quoting the problems that LTSL has previously had, and the fact that external circumstances may make the budgets less relevant. (This latter issue was developed well by some candidates by considering the current economic climate.)

- 2 Almost all candidates identified methods of improving recruitment and showed sufficient understanding and application to achieve Level 2. However, many candidates wasted considerable time explaining why the existing methods were inappropriate; for example, the unsuitability of handing out leaflets at the train station, rather than entering more rapidly into a discussion of how methods might be improved (which is what the question asked). Often, the suggested improvements were vague or inappropriate, for example, using TV, newspapers or radio. Many candidates were unable to think in terms of targeted methods and failed to use the context. Another major problem was the number of candidates who had not read the case study carefully enough and spent their time describing how interpreters could be recruited when, in fact, these are not employed in Cardiff.

Better answers focused on how national media, websites and specialist agencies would be more effective at finding large numbers of more specialist staff. A small number of candidates also suggested the benefits of promoting internally and then recruiting someone to fill a lower level post.

- 3 This marketing question was much better answered than in recent series; many candidates managed to use the case material to argue the effectiveness of promotional methods such as the use of the existing website, mailing/e-mailing existing customers, advertising in trade magazines and personal selling. However, surprisingly few candidates considered the global nature of the business and the issues the business might face in creating awareness of the new service in many countries, as opposed to just one. Also, candidates often wrote about contacting potential customers without specifying how this would be achieved. The better answers came from candidates who had clearly been prepared for the B2B context and the impact of this on promotional methods.

Weaker answers saw candidates confusing above and below the line promotion and many seemed to be unaware that promotion is not exclusively advertising. A few candidates also mistakenly wrote about promoting staff, rather than marketing promotion.

- 4 As in previous series, this question on economies of scale was particularly poorly answered. Many candidates simply had no knowledge of economies of scale and resorted to general comments about increasing market share leading to the business being bigger, more profitable or more famous. Some candidates knew that as output increased, unit costs fell, but then went on to write about LTSL reducing its prices to the customers who bought in bulk. Some candidates wrote about the general benefits of increasing in size and of trading overseas.

A common weakness across responses was the belief that gaining access to cheap labour in low cost countries would be an economy of scale. Another problem, which was centre specific, was the wide-scale misunderstanding of technical economies of scale, with many candidates 'inventing' the concept of technological economies of scale.

Those answers which achieved Level 3 or 4 considered that bulk buying was unlikely for a service business, managerial economies were unlikely as the majority of staff are freelance and financial economies were unlikely as the business currently has no loans. The best responses pointed out that the budgets indicated falling revenue against increasing fixed costs, suggesting that diseconomies of scale were, in fact, already evident.

## **Summary**

- Use of context to make answers non-generic is vital. Using the case study is not the same as copying it out.
- Most candidates seemed to have sufficient time to complete the paper.
- Some candidates are still entering the examination room without a calculator.
- Question 4 was the least well answered, with many candidates not knowing what economies of scale are.
- Any judgements must be justified.
- The general standard of written communication remains poor.

## 2874: Further Marketing

### General Comments

Overall, there were some outstanding scripts and few really very poor ones. The opening question was a departure from the format of recent papers but the question was not testing difficult or technical areas of the specification and it was a useful lead-in to the rest of the paper. The scenario was considered by the examination team to be easy to understand and offered a wealth of material for candidates to use and this material was not couched in difficult language. Each of the questions set could have been answered in a variety of ways using material drawn from the case study. The 'numbers' question tested many candidates, to a greater extent than some in the past perhaps, but was entirely within the grasp of A Level candidates who had covered the specification. The 'strategy' question was a standard one and could have been approached from a variety of angles. It was disappointing that, again, many candidates did not start their answers by defining the terms in the question and, again, only a very few attempted any evaluative comment. Candidates who focused on what the questions asked generally did very well.

Most candidates seemed to have devoted appropriate time to each of the questions. Indeed, most showed evidence that they had studied this area of the specification at an appropriate level, though there were many who did not display this knowledge and understanding across all question.

Written communication was generally good; two marks out of two being the 'norm'. The greatest disappointment proved to be the numerate question which was set on the topic of sales forecasting. There remains plenty of evidence to suggest that some centres are failing to give such topics appropriate teaching time in class. On this occasion, many candidates simply had not covered sales forecasting in sufficient detail. This made answering the numerate question difficult in itself but also had implications for the 'follow-up' question too. Finally, in the 'strategy' question, candidates are still not making use of the actual evidence presented.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) Most candidates showed an understanding of appropriate factors. However, a large number of candidates merely stated a number of these, or repeated facts from the case concerning the business, without making it clear that these facts were, indeed, the factors influencing visits. These answers could be credited, however, if an appropriate link was made. A minority answered a different question and provided a marketing mix designed to attract more visitors; some credit could be given here. Many candidates scored within Level 3 by relating relevant factors to the case study and very few attempted to rank the factors discussed.
- 1 (b) (i) Many candidates failed to attempt this part of the question and the majority scored zero. The most common answer was a change of 2500, with no reference to the seasonal variation. A small number gave the right number for the change as 61,500 but not all indicated this was a decrease. Many candidates who attempted the question worked from a figure of 352,000, ignoring the 500. Some candidates read across the tables and confused the quarters. Overall, this proved to be a disappointing 'numbers' question.
- 1 (b) (ii) This was a question where candidates who gave an explanation of Time Series Analysis tended to score well as it enabled them to comment on how the business used it. A very large number of candidates went no further than stating that Time Series Analysis enabled some forecasting to take place,

without explaining how. Many of these did refer to seasonal variation later in the response. Only a small number actually referred to the data in the case and, with this omission, this prevented more than Level 2 being. Many Level 2 answers were general, mentioning how a forecast enabled planning of, eg promotion campaigns or staffing to take place. Similarly, there were general comments about how Time Series Analysis must be used alongside other methods or how exogenous unexpected shocks might disturb forecasts. Level 4, however, was rarely awarded as candidates had not explained Time Series Analysis, their answer could have been about any forecasting method and/or had no case context. A significant number of candidates displayed no knowledge or understanding of Time Series Analysis.

- 2 (a) Most candidates were able to 'expand' on the acronym (Level 1). Many then either gave examples relating to BirdTown or explained how a SWOT might be used in general terms (Level 2). Few candidates then went on to produce examples of how Gerry might use these to enable him to place his business in a market position or in relation to moving forward or reacting to events (Level 3).
- 2 (b) This part of the question gave candidates the chance to bring in a variety of definitions or examples of marketing success. Most candidates were able to explore at least one marketing success issue, either by giving examples of how marketing methods achieve success or exploring the meaning of marketing success. Not all candidates, however, related this issue to BirdTown's objectives. Some candidates, on the other hand, stated an issue but with no comments relating to marketing. The majority of candidates gave some ways in which marketing methods might help achieve stated objectives though the majority of these did not refer to specifics from the case study; they merely made general points. Some candidates, unfortunately, did appear to have noticed the requirement for analysing "...**two** ways...".
- 2 (c) In terms of an appropriate response, a multitude of possibilities existed here. Nearly every candidate achieved at least Level 2 with a reference to objectives, methods, research and the marketing mix. Many answers were either in the form of an extended list and/or straight descriptions with no attempt to be strategic. Successful responses at Level 3 either linked elements of the marketing mix, gave reasons for and against elements, produced a progression from objectives via audit, methods and evaluation or analysed different approaches for different product areas. Those candidates who attempted to use models/tools such as the Boston or Ansoff's matrix or AIDA generally did so less well; they often described the model/tool but did not then apply it appropriately. Some, however, achieved this successfully. It is worth noting that even good analytical answers seldom finished with a conclusion which ranked the importance of the elements discussed or showed some sense of time scale. There were, however, a noticeable number of candidates who did state eg "...the best method is...." without then providing a justification for the conclusion.

## 2875: Further Accounting and Finance

### General Comments

As usual the paper successfully discriminated between candidates. There was evidence that the number of under prepared candidates had fallen and stronger candidates demonstrated good analytical skills. However, many candidates failed to make evaluative comments based upon the preceding analysis. An inability to draw logical and valid conclusions denies access to the Level 4 mark band, essential for a top grade. As is often the case, candidates might benefit from being reminded (yet again) that:

- questions should be read with great care. Failure to do this will result in an incorrectly focused answer;
- numerical calculations need to be set out in a coherent manner;
- calculations alone do not constitute the answer to a question which requires a recommendation or a decision;
- generic type answers should be avoided. Close reference to the context of the case is essential;
- accounting and financial terminology is precise and specific. Candidates need to gain a secure grasp of concepts. A general vague understanding is not adequate.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) The vast majority of candidates found this contribution question very accessible. The correct answer of £110,000 was given by many (£170,000 – £60,000). Some candidates made arithmetic errors and a number did the calculation on a unit basis (£5.5) failing to note that the question asked for the total contribution generated by the production of wine in 2008.
- (b) There were many generic answers concerning profit centres given by candidates. Thus, there was no attempt made to relate their knowledge to the circumstances of the case. The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate both knowledge and understanding of the concept of a profit centre. However, relatively few were able to assess the usefulness of the concept beyond noting that it is useful! The best answers focused on considering the value of the concept as an aid to the management of CEL. Careful reading of a question is essential if high marks are to be gained; a number of candidates gave a good description of the concept of a profit centre, but then often failed to consider how they help management, yet alone considering the extent to which they help. Nevertheless there were many competent responses given to this part of the question.
- (c) This part of the question proved challenging for many candidates. Once again many failed to read the question sufficiently carefully, choosing to consider the impact that the purchase of fixed assets would have on profits and cash flow, not the depreciation of such assets would have on cash and profits. Some answers clearly explained the concept of depreciation and even went through different methods of depreciation such as straight line and declining balance. Most candidates were aware that depreciation had an adverse impact on profits and attempted to show how it was recorded in the accounts of a business. Few, however, were able to point out that depreciation is a book-keeping cost and does not represent a cash flow expenditure as such. Many answers simply said that when a fixed asset was bought it represented an outflow and when it was sold for less in the future a reduced cash inflow would occur. The question as a whole was not well answered.

(d) This part of the question was well answered by many candidates. Better candidates were able to analyse the data given by means of investment appraisal methods such as payback, ARR and net present values. The best candidates then evaluated the outcome of their financial appraisal in terms of qualitative factors such as business risk and funding implications. Even stronger candidates were able to assess the options further by considering how the options fitted into the existing business position by considering their synergy. The examiners were pleased to see the number of candidates who attempted an analysis of the financial data by the use of sensible methods. However, the presentation of calculations by many leaves much to be desired. Furthermore, too many candidates failed to show how their figures are derived. Hence, a number incorrectly calculated the annual net cash flows of the options but failed to show how their figures had been arrived at. The use of discounting as a method of appraisal still proves a mystery to many candidates. Both options gave low payback periods and option A gave a much higher positive net present value demonstrating its financial attraction. However, many candidates were able to point out that the funding of the ventures was likely to prove problematic. Probably the best course of action for CEL was to delay both options until a stronger capital base was established. This was argued successfully by a few candidates. Many candidates felt that despite their misgivings they should still recommend one option. Overall this part of the question proved very accessible to the well prepared candidate.

- 2 (a) The impact of interest rate rises on CEL's costs was a straight forward concept which allowed most candidates to show knowledge and understanding. The majority were able to calculate that the anticipated rise in interest rates of 2% would increase the annual cost of the bank loan to £32000 from £24000. The annual cost of the overdraft would rise from £2750 to £3750. Thus, overall the interest charges of the business would rise annually by £9000. The question asked for an analysis of the impact not merely a calculation of the impact. Thus, better candidates were able to place this increase in costs into context to show its significance. This could be done by noting that profits would be down by 10.8% or that total costs would rise by 3.5%. The most common error in calculating the impact of the interest rate rise was to simply increase interest costs by 2% from £26,750 to £27,285. A significant number of candidates made this error.
- (b) This part of the question proved quite challenging for many candidates. This was perhaps because the candidates had to analyse the data given to generate the contribution figures for 2008, so that a comparison with 2007 could be carried out. The results of such analysis revealed that the total contribution had fallen by £27,000 in 2008. This was due to a fall in the contribution of wine sales of £30,000, and of bed and breakfast by £2000 partly offset by a rise in Cafe contribution of £5000. The net profits of the business overall fell by £32,000 in 2008. Thus 2008 probably had not been a good year certainly financially for the business.

Many candidates made an attempt to use at least some of the data to help analyse the performance of CEL. A number of candidates calculated both the gross and net profit margins in 2008. However, a few made arithmetic errors in their calculations and often made invalid assumptions. Again, the lay out of numerical calculations fell below the expected level and made the logic behind errors difficult to assess. The best candidates combined the outcome of their financial analysis with a judgement on qualitative issues such as the vulnerability of the business to climatic influences and external economic factors. Overall, this part of the question proved quite demanding and certainly discriminated well between candidates.



## 2876: Further People in Organisations

### General comments

In recent reports it has been stated that performance is often adversely impacted upon by candidates having difficulty extracting numerical data from the text/tables from within in the case study and then using the data to calculate an appropriate outcome. However, in this particular instance candidates did seem to capitalise on the opportunity to gain what were a relatively straightforward four marks, although the second calculation was slightly less well answered than the first.

Again it was noticeable that many candidates still failed to use the context of the case study in their answers; as a result, candidates offered responses which could apply to any business anywhere, rather than specifically to the coach firm in question. Candidates who scored well did so because they avoided the afore-mentioned mistakes. Overall, this paper revealed that many candidates had a sound knowledge of relevant theories and concepts, but all too often poor examination technique and insufficient use of the case study proved to be the undoing of too many of them. There were also a lot of candidates who did not know much about responding to health and safety issues. This was in contrast to the consequences/benefits of trade union recognition or methods of reducing labour turnover. This highlights the need to ensure that the specification has been appropriately covered.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) Many candidates managed to get full marks for these questions arriving at the answer of 11.25%. Some candidates would have been well advised to check their final calculation when offering 'unrealistic' answers.
- 1 (b) There was one very important word in this question – consequences. Whilst this question was often quite well answered, unfortunately many candidates chose to ignore consequences and either wrote about different methods of remuneration, or methods the coach firm could use. Candidates who used the context of the case study and actually answered the question invariably scored high level 2 or level 3 marks.  
Better candidates used the calculation from 1 a as part of their reasoning, indicating that it would probably be more effective and less problematical to give the workers the pay similar or equivalent to those being offered by other local coach companies.
- 1 (c) (i) This part of the question proved to be slightly more difficult for candidates, not because of the complexity of the calculation, but primarily due to the fact that often candidates did not extract the appropriate information from the case study.
- 1 (c) (ii) Most candidates had a basic grasp of what labour turnover is. However, there were many more who had plenty of knowledge, but could not build on this knowledge to provide any relevant contextual analysis. Consequently, a lot of candidates were unable to move beyond the Level 2 mark band. All too often weaker candidates insisted that labour turnover could be reduced by empowerment, job rotation, responsibility, without considering the actual job – coach driving!

*Report on the Units taken in January 2009*

- 2 (a) The key word in this part of the question was “evaluate”. Candidates who did not, indeed, evaluate wasted the opportunity to access the marks in the top mark band and for many this turned out to be an expensive omission. However, there were a few better candidates who were able to consider the pros and cons of various outcomes of Pete’s summary dismissal, with some contextual judgement which clearly used case study evidence/justification for their views. More common was the ability to demonstrate some analytical skills of a relevant nature, but not to progress any further; therefore, leaving their answer somewhere in the Level 3 mark band. The most common error was to treat the question as “write all you know about dismissal”, ignoring relevant case study issues/evidence.
- 2 (b) Many candidates chose to ignore the fact that the focus should have been on how CCL (Bob) could/should respond, seemingly focusing on the various possible consequences of having older coaches inappropriately maintained. A lot of candidates concentrated on the mechanics of the process, which could relate to anybody in any business bringing about possible health and safety problems by having an attitude such as Bob’s. Whilst some of these points may be relevant, a mere recital of such issues could not progress candidates beyond Level 1. Better candidates realised that there were various possible responses, explained what they might be, and prioritised what they thought might be most appropriate – these candidates were part of a substantial minority!
- 2 (c) Once again the keyword, “analyse”, was ignored by many candidates and not evident in many of their answers. Furthermore, many candidates focused on “all I know about membership of trade unions” and not the benefits to Bob, his business, and/or the workers of having trade union membership recognised. Consequently, there was a preponderance of low Level 2 type answers. The better candidates used the case study material well and offered relevant suggestions in context.

Hints on improving candidate performance in future examinations, as previously reported:

- 1 practice developing examination technique; use previous 2876 case studies, questions and mark schemes;
- 2 teach candidates in more detail about the different levels of skills being tested;
- 3 focus on ensuring that candidates can cope with any type of question requiring calculations based on ‘people’ concepts;
- 4 make sure that the specification has been covered thoroughly, not selectively.

## 2877: Further Operations Management

### General Comments

This proved to be a challenging paper for many of the candidates. The topics covered on the paper have all appeared in the recent past and some of the problems observed were of the candidates' own making. For example where the questions asked how a change in a business's circumstances might impact on its operations, then clearly we are not expecting answers about finance, marketing or human resources. This is a paper about one of the business behaviours, operations management, and candidates answers should clearly reflect this. Sometimes, candidates only developed one issue. This was especially true of Question 1(c), where candidates focussed solely on economic changes, ignoring all the other external environment factors which were clearly flagged up in the case study.

Use of the case study was also weak in a number of candidates' answers. It is difficult to understand why this is the case, given the fact that all the papers are based on a specific business and candidates ought to know better than to just produce a generic response.

It was also felt that the standard of handwriting on a number of scripts was poor. Candidates do themselves no favours if examiners are having to spend time pondering over the meaning of words or sentences. If candidates do have problems with handwriting, then centres need to avail themselves of the opportunity for candidates to word process their scripts.

Finally, there seemed to be a few candidates who failed to finish the paper. This was often due to their answers to the shorter questions, 1(a) and 1(b), being too lengthy. As previously reported, there are 60 marks to be gained in 90 minutes, so roughly one mark every one and a half minutes. Candidates need to watch the time and make sure they leave long enough to tackle those questions carrying the highest mark tariffs, which often occur towards the end of the paper.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) Most candidates scored marks on this part of the question, although the most frequent error was where candidates confused the term "multi-skilled" with being a specialist. A further weakness evident in a number of scripts was the failure to relate the answer to the case study, and so present it in context. If this is not done, then it is not possible to "analyse the benefits to TTNC".
- (b) Questions on the topic of work study are often badly done but there is significant evidence that this is a centre rather than a candidate problem - in other words this is a topic that certain centres do not teach to their candidates. Given that work study is clearly on the specification, and questions have been asked on a number of previous occasions, it clearly should be covered. In those centres where candidates had been taught, there were some very good answers which mentioned, for example, Taylor, method study and work measurement.
- (c) The performance of many candidates on this part of the question was quite disappointing. Most could identify appropriate external environmental factors and, indeed, many were flagged up in the case study (the economy, legal requirements, environmental issues etc.). However, many candidates ignored the fact that the question asked how changes "might affect operations at TTNC". Far too many talked about pricing or revenue and profit implications, which is not an appropriate response and, therefore, these candidates did not get into the Level 3 mark band.

Furthermore, a number of candidates wrote at length about the state of the economy and its impact on TTNC, ignoring other important external environmental factors. However, good responses mentioned a number of changes, including how the current state of the economy might impact on the business and its operations, eg possible loss of sales due to the recession and, therefore, having to cut back on production and possibly lay off workers.

- 2 (a) The calculation was generally well done; most candidates scored the four marks, correctly calculating the new breakeven at 10 boats.
- (b) This part of the question asked candidates to discuss the operational implications of increasing capacity from eight to 20 boats. Whilst there were still a significant number of candidates who discussed issues such as how TTNC might sell the extra boats or how TTNC might finance the expansion, many candidates did discuss relevant operational issues, such as staffing, stock levels and methods of production. Some excellent answers regarding supply issues, for example, looked at the current types and location of suppliers and whether they would be able to supply TTNC with its needs and, given the constraints of space at TTNC, whether the firm might need to move to just-in-time supply or if it might be able to gain discounts through scale economies. Discussion of the labour issues commonly centred around whether it would be easy to recruit multi-skilled workers of the type TTNC needs. However, to gain Level 4 marks, candidates ought to have highlighted what, in their opinion, the most significant operational implications might be and not whether the firm should go ahead with the expansion.
- (c) Many candidates misunderstood the question, failing to read the relevant section of the case study and think about why TTNC might want to split the operational areas into two separate businesses. These two main areas are very different; one is a manufacturing business and the other a service business, although there are some clear links between the two, eg boats were built for hire originally and they could then be maintained and serviced at Bumper's Farm. Only the best candidates seemed to be able to argue for and against splitting these operational areas into separate businesses, discussing the complementary nature of the two aspects of TTNC and their financial interdependence, but balancing this with some discussion of the freedom which might be gained as each part of the business could focus on its area of specialism.

## **2878: Business Project**

### **Introduction**

In general, the standard of the Projects seemed to be slightly weaker than last series. Also this time, fewer centres included comments on the front sheets of projects and more centres actually wrote on the projects themselves. This is a pity because comments on the front sheet enables the moderator to pinpoint effectively both where they can, and where they cannot, agree the original mark. This then enables us to provide a much more useful report for the centre. Fortunately, there seemed to be less evidence of arithmetic errors on the front sheets.

### **The Marking Process**

Once again I have to stress a point I have made many times. The key to a good mark is a good title and a well documented reason for looking at the problem. It is very difficult for good marks to be awarded when the foundation of the project is not good and, therefore, descriptive writing is all that is achieved. This creates the problem that candidates do not really clarify and measure the effects of the problem on the business before they start. This inhibits their ability to make really relevant research and the higher skills are not demonstrated.

Many centres had taken on board comments made previously regarding the size and content of the Appendices and there were less 'weighty' contributions this series. Hence there were fewer centres that included every printout, questionnaire and pamphlet. There was also less evidence of candidates following a rather limiting structure.

Objectives still present a problem. The whole purpose of objectives is to ensure that the problem has been carefully considered and the report methodology follows a consistent and logical path towards solutions and recommendations. Objectives are meant to be feasible outcomes to be pursued in the report with some assessment at the end of the extent to which this has been successful. Too many candidates understood the need to state objectives but never really used them or checked whether they had been achieved. Objectives which are just there are never worth more than Level 2 and in many cases Level 1 is more appropriate.

On the whole the standard and scope of research was good with better focused questionnaires, better size samples and better sampling processes. This ensures a good mark on criterion 3 but something more than good research procedures is necessary for Level 4 achievement. The research should be underpinned by a good understanding of what is needed and how it is to be collated and used. Good questions are of little value if the manner of recording the answers does not permit aggregation. Words like "occasionally", "regularly" and even worse, "lots of times" or "often" are of no value in the collating process. This often means that good initial work is rendered valueless.

Candidates still show a reluctance, or an inability, to find and use good secondary research. This sometimes means that the primary research lacks focus or is incomplete and does not convince. There is still a tendency to over-reward criterion 4 in these situations.

Criterion five is all about the use of knowledge and there is still evidence of over-reward merely because it is demonstrated. One purpose of the Project is to reward the candidate who can apply relevant knowledge to a problem and its solution in a way which supports the solving process and this requires much more than understanding what has been written.

I re-iterate the advice that business theory should be written about at the point of use and not isolated in separate sections from which some may be selected later in the report. Candidates

## *Report on the Units taken in January 2009*

who wrote using theory effectively and with good knowledge but who did not take time to write the theory out in detail were often under-rewarded.

Analysis and evaluation are often over-rewarded. In the case of analysis is often because it is talked about rather than undertaken. There are several ways of analysing but the central feature of all of them is that data previously gathered into the report is taken and turned into evidence to assist in the definition and solution of the chosen problem or in the making of the required decision. Only if this focusing process is evident in the work should it be rewarded above Level 2 on criterion six.

Just as analysis requires a focusing process, evaluation requires a justifying process. For a high level mark on criterion 7 there needs to be a reasoned argument which is also balanced and based upon the data which has been analysed. There are always elements of this process which require critical appreciation and this is the feature of a response at Level four.

Examples: An investment appraisal project should show good understanding, and inclusion, of, the factors in the decision which may be significant beyond the financial calculations. In many other projects the business reality of some possible projects often needs to be considered.

In general the mark of 5 is too often awarded for criteria 8 and 9. Such a mark implies that all the features required of a good report have been well demonstrated and the work has been proof read so that the standard of written communication is also high. There is also a reluctance to award a mark lower than 3 on these criteria. There is little excuse for poor written communication in work which there is ample time to correct. The features of a report should be well known to all candidates. Some of the work we have seen would have been more accurately awarded a Level 2 or even Level 1 response.

### **Other Matters**

The administrative elements of this unit are a significant aspect of the overall assessment and these were very smooth this time with few problems and little need to extend the process unduly. We are very grateful for this but would remind centres of the absolute need to ensure that the centre authentication sheet is with the work sent to the Moderator.

## **2879: The Business Thematic Enquiry**

### **Introduction**

The bookshop survival theme proved very candidate friendly with very little evidence of time constraint and many fewer cases of either wandering away from the requirements of the paper, or over-structuring or writing essays instead of reports. There was also a much greater preparedness than has been the case in the past to use the numerate data and to find external support for the issues raised. So much so, in fact, that some candidates paid less attention to the case than was required.

Current economic circumstances provided a rich background upon which candidates could draw and many took that opportunity, using it well. The case also provided a range of opportunities to use theory across the specification and many used those opportunities to great effect. Despite that we were often regaled with wide ranging uses or non-uses of Ansoff and SWOT. Contribution was variously interpreted and calculated, often leading candidates away from the more sustainable lines of argument and requiring reward of the report to be related to the candidates' own figure rule.

Nevertheless the over all standard was higher with more candidates deservedly reaching a total of 60+ and fewer below 45.

### **The Plan**

There were fewer poor plans and many more very good ones, although context and problem definition were often run together. There was also a great improvement in understanding and stating objectives for the report. This time the writing of business instead of report related objectives was rare. However, there were still many that were generic rather than problem related. In most cases this was because the objectives were pre-learned. Nevertheless, there were many more candidates whose reports were objective led leading to higher reward for criterion 2 than has commonly been the case.

There were more plans this time in which candidates engaged in discussion which should appear in the report and be argued in reasonable detail and there were a few instances of rejection of one of the options, usually the taxi one, either with brief mention in the plan or as an assumption. This is not an acceptable way to limit report discussion. The range and number of assumptions made was much greater this time. Surprisingly, a significant number chose to assume that the economy was stable. Some made assumptions, particularly about Jeni, that lost them opportunities to discuss the human resource aspects of the case.

### **The Report**

The structure of most reports is now much better. Most candidates had at least an acceptable structure and few wasted time on unnecessarily long introductions. One common weakness, however, was the failure to quote a source for assertions made about evidence from external sources.

There was still some unnecessary repetition of things already presented in the plan. In one instance the plan and objectives were repeated in their entirety and this is a pointless waste of valuable time. There were also a few candidates whose report was descriptive with little evidence of analysis and evaluation but this was less prevalent than in previous series.

## *Report on the Units taken in January 2009*

The good use of external research from both bookshops and taxi firms was welcome and was normally well used. The argument taken from the present state of the economy was at times quite impressive but in a few cases overdone to the detriment of the report. In these cases it tended to replace case evidence.

Financial evidence was in abundance in the case and it quite rightly formed the basis of most discussions. There were a few candidates, however, who did not use it at all. There were some who did little more than allude to its importance. Many calculated payback on a range of assumptions and used the figures in a variety of ways; they showed understanding of the significance of payback in this context and often argued good cases from it.

There was opportunity to make good use of marketing and human resource situations and the theory relating to them. Surprisingly, this was less well undertaken in many scripts and sometimes precluded by the assumptions candidates made in the plan. Jeni was often well considered in the school books option but few saw the possibilities provided by the potential unsuitable career switch to be made in the taxi option.

There were some instances where one of the option was given detailed analysis and the other dismissed with very little consideration. This often made the overall report rather unconvincing. There was also evidence of a rather careless reading of the case. In the main this related to the source of finance. The case states that the Loverings would be able to finance out of savings. Some candidates did not see that and often spent time arguing about the difficulty of finding finance. This often led to a false preference against the taxi service because it required heavier financial support. Few candidates saw that the injection of money from the Loverings reduced the financial burden and the strain which might be associated with long payback periods.

### **Conclusion**

We concluded that most candidates were significantly better prepared for this examination than for some previous ones. Structurally reports were better, more evidence was brought in from outside and the two options were argued with greater depth and effectiveness. In addition better use was made of business studies theory.



## 2880: Business Strategy

The paper discriminated well, with most candidates able to offer a decent answer to at least one of the four questions. As such, the examining team all felt that this paper was set at the appropriate standard. Given the material in the pre-release case study it is perhaps not surprising that Question 3 was the most well answered. This style of decision making question is a now well establish aspect of this specification. Centres preparing candidates for the replacement specification can be assured that a similar style of question will feature on the equivalent “new” unit, F297, Business Strategy.

It is pleasing to be able to again report that there was very little evidence of candidates running out of time. Similarly, the incidence of candidates missing out an entire question has declined to such an extent that it is now something of a rarity. As reported previously, the poor quality of candidates’ handwriting struck many in the examining team. Whatever can be done by centres to make improvements here would be very much appreciated!

Another message that centres would be advised to get across to their candidates concerns evaluation. As all four questions on this unit require an evaluative approach it is essential that candidates know how to exhibit this skill. To repeat what has been said many times before, evaluation is simply a reasoned judgement. Evaluation is not simply expressing an opinion; rather it is the chain of reasoning, embedded in the subject and the case evidence that leads to the view. As was often the case in assessing Question 3, the examiner may not agree with a candidate’s final decision but will, nonetheless, happily award full marks if the reasoning is robustly supported by accurate use of the subject’s theory, vocabulary, techniques and case evidence.

The reluctance of candidates to engage with the numerate evidence in the case is now a well established frustration. Much could have been done with Appendix 2, for example, but little was. Similarly, the other numerate evidence was simply ignored. However, and rather ironically, the use of number for its own sake out of the context of the question serves little purpose. Thus, the inclusion of the acid test and current ratio (and it so often is these two ratios) is not in itself rewardable unless this analysis is actually pertinent to the question set.

Although some may claim it to be otherwise, there is no intention to set questions to catch candidates out. Sadly, Question 4 did that for far too many. Rather than evaluate relevant factors concerning location, which is what the question asked, many candidates wrote about why the move to Coventry was the best idea for BCC. The need to read questions carefully, and then to answer them, cannot be stressed too highly. It was said last time that “question spotting” is a very dangerous strategy and, if wrong, will adversely impact on the candidates’ total mark.” The point seemingly bears repeating.

A common error seen in many scripts was the confusion between output and capacity. It is disappointing, at this level, to read claims of reducing labour turnover, for example, leading to increased capacity.

- 1 This question is one which has long been overdue on this unit. At the lower end of the ability range candidates used this as an opportunity to display their command of human resource theory. Some, regrettably, simply did not have an accurate knowledge of this aspect of the subject and, as such, what was written was poorly received. Better answers were accurate, but far too generic. As ever, the need to contextualise answers is vital. Consequently, an answer which could equally apply to Sainsbury’s scores top Level 2 at best. For example, having been told that the work is unskilled (sticking a glace cheery on a chilled trifle is not difficult) it is hard to accept that better training is a “cure” for

absenteeism. So, whilst extensive human resource theory is pleasing to see, it has to be applied to the context described in the case study to be well rewarded.

Better candidates used Appendix 2 to argue that the fundamental issue could not be mechanical or material. Rather, given that waste, accidents and absenteeism seems to peak either side of the weekend, it must be due to the employees' attitude. Solutions ranged from pay through to fear. The role of pay fell into two main camps. First, raise pay above the levels they are. Second, and in marked contrast to the first, that if pay really is so poor, then employees could not afford to take days off. One feature of very good answers was to adopt a strategic approach by suggesting before BCC did anything it would be sensible to really diagnose the problem and understand what the cause is, not simply seek to deal with the symptom. One starting point for this analysis was holding exit interviews, and then depending what reasons are given to seek to improve motivation from there.

- 2 Reading the question carefully shows it has two parts. One is about unemployment, the other about reaching BCC's 2010 objectives. Those candidates who addressed both parts scored well. Those candidates who only considered unemployment did less well. As always, read the question – answer the question.

The case study indicates that BCC faces an income elasticity of demand for its products equal to 1.5. As such, it was difficult to argue that falling income would lead to rising sales. However, if the data in the case was questioned (rather than simply ignored) this line of argument was accepted. Generally, the argument was that a cream cake is a cheap(ish) indulgence product, and as it takes a small slice of weekly income, people will still want to treat themselves in order to cheer themselves up even when incomes fall.

The best answers considered both the product and the labour market. With regard to the labour market, rising unemployment was seen as an opportunity to replace under-performing employees with better workers who have now become available (the possible legal issues were rarely acknowledged). Alternatively, labour turnover and absenteeism should fall as employees have fewer realistic alternatives to BCC. Such an argument is good, and would have been so much better if this had then been linked to BCC's 2010 objectives. For example, reduced labour turnover would mean less recruitment, selection, induction and training costs and so would serve to boost BCC's margin.

Very few candidates considered different types of unemployment. For example, regional (Warwickshire) unemployment might have little impact in the product market but could well impact upon BCC's labour market. Similarly, few went for the standard routes to evaluation of scale and speed of the increase.

- 3 This was a well anticipated question and for many candidates the most highly rewarded on the script. There were a wealth of issues which could have been used to support the view taken by the candidate. For many the order simply did not make sense; sales are rising anyway, there is insufficient capacity, the price and credit terms are unfavourable and so on. Some candidates who opted for the order used Ansoff as a reason, and the credit crunch was seen as a reason to move down market. Vocabulary, such as opportunity cost, risk, strategic direction, which one might reasonably expect to read, was largely absent. Consequently, and especially at the lower end, the view offered could often come across as simply a common sense answer rather than a Business Studies answer.
- 4 A lack of care in reading this question proved to be the undoing of many candidates. Several factors could have been considered, and arriving at a supported view as to which was the most important could have resulted (and in a few instances did) in full/near full marks. High up that list should have been BCC's objectives. Likewise, the issue of capital cost, available finance and return on investment were widely anticipated as being worthy of

*Report on the Units taken in January 2009*

discussion. Hence, and making a few assumptions, it could be shown that the investment in the Coventry site takes 23.5 years to pay back, and has an ARR of 4.26%. The issue then is to think about whether it is sensible for BCC to pay £25m, given these figures. A less readily quantifiable, but nonetheless important, factor was the operational benefit (and risk) of consolidating all production on a single site.

There was a widely held belief that closing all three sites and moving to Coventry would mean a loss of output during the move. Similarly, some candidates thought that as there is £21.4m of shareholders funds shown in the balance sheet, then BCC has the bulk of the capital already available.

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Business Studies (3811/7811)  
January 2009 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2871	Raw	45	34	31	28	25	22	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2872	Raw	45	29	26	23	21	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2873	Raw	60	37	33	29	26	23	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2874	Raw	60	35	31	28	25	22	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2875	Raw	60	39	35	31	28	25	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2876	Raw	60	39	35	32	29	26	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2877	Raw	60	36	32	28	25	22	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2878	Raw	90	72	63	54	46	38	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2879	Raw	90	69	63	58	53	48	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2880	Raw	80	55	49	44	39	34	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3811	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7811	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3811	9.8	31.7	63.9	86.6	98.8	100	414
7811	10.9	41.3	71.7	95.7	97.8	100	51

**465 candidates aggregated this series**

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2009

