

APPLIED GENERAL APPLIED BUSINESS

1830/ABS/U Centre Assessed Units Report on the Examination

1830/ABS/U June 2023

Version: 1.0



General comments

As in previous series, successful students understood the criteria and had the ability to carry out focused research and analysis. When tackling distinction criteria, these students demonstrated the skill of making supported judgments founded on the analysis of applied research. When required by the criterion (eg all of the criteria in ABS2), these students could make a reasoned evaluation ie one based on contrasting supported judgments.

Less successful students struggled to demonstrate an ability to make supported judgments but could analyse focused research ie they had the ability to complete the merit criteria. The least successful students struggled to collect relevant data and seldom went beyond description in context ie they completed the pass criteria and attempted some merit criteria to varying degrees of success.

Previous reports (eg Summer 2022) provide guidance on the meaning of analysis and supported judgments in the context of this qualification.

Administration

In this session it was apparent that many centres had forgotten the importance of completing a Centre Declaration Sheet. This is an OFQUAL requirement and **must** be completed, the form included in the samples sent to each moderator. Only **one** CDS needs to be completed but it must be signed by all assessors across the units being submitted.

Annotation

Centres using the abbreviations for qualities were notably more accurate in their decision making than those who defaulted to ticks or, in the worse cases, no annotation whatsoever. Moderation is the task of qualifying assessment decisions. If a moderator cannot understand those decisions, then moderation descends into prime marking which is not the intention.

Please refer to previous reports (eg Summer 2022) for guidance. However, as a brief summary:

- Pass criteria evidence: C&T (indicating that context is evident and the theory required by the criterion is understood)
- Merit criteria: COA (indicating that a successful chain of argument, in context and addressing the focus of the criterion, has been evidenced)
- Distinction criteria: SJ (indicating that a supported judgment, logically based on a successful COA and addressing the focus of the criterion, has been evidenced)
- Distinction criteria: Eval (indicating, where this is required by the criterion, that at least two
 contrasting SJs have been used to address the criterion)

Holistic assessment

It continues to be the case that some assessors struggle to assess the **entirety** of each student's unit evidence before reaching an assessment decision on a specific criterion. For example, just because a student has not completed a merit column in an evidence template, it does not mean that appropriate evidence is absent as it could have occurred in the pass column or in a different template.

On the other hand, it's pleasing to see many centres using evidence in such a manner eg by using evidence in a distinction template column to support achievement of the associated merit criterion.

ABS2

It was encouraging to see far fewer misinterpretations of criteria. However, it is still the case that some centres struggle to understand:

- P2 stakeholders **must** be in context
- P3/M2 the **organisational structure** is being considered and **not** functional areas in isolation
- M3 the effectiveness of the business's recruitment is in terms of the suitability of recruits rather than the process eq have the right people been recruited
- D4 evidence supporting the extent to which the policies improved the competitive position must be used ie this is not a speculative evaluation and must be based on actual outcomes

As already mentioned, the most disturbing feature of this year's moderation was the lack, at times, of evidence supporting **evaluation**. Supported judgments were often present across the distinction criteria, but it was often difficult to identify how these had been used to make a logical evaluation.

ABS5

Assessment was broadly accurate and many students achieved success through this unit. Where difficulties occurred it was, as in ABS2, due to a lack of evaluation ie in criterion D4. In addition, several centres struggled to understand the meaning of coherence in criteria M5 and D3. In particular, D3 requires a holistic consideration of coherence ie how **all** of the plans work together to support an effective proposal.

Optional Units (ABS6, 7 and 8)

It was pleasing to moderate these units, with ABS8 being the unit chosen by the vast majority of centres. Evidence was always applied and students made an effort to analyse their research. As already mentioned, the most successful students demonstrated an admirable ability to make supported judgments.

However, as in ABS2 and ABS5, distinction criteria requiring **evaluation** were often dubiously evidenced ie supported judgments were present but not attempt to contrast these, when making an evaluation, was evidenced. For all three units, this relates to distinction criteria D3 and D5. For ABS8, students often struggled to understand the significance of **coherence** in D5. The main focus here should be on 'integrated use of channels' and 'message consistency'. For ABS7, centres are reminded that the event **must** take place and that students should present evidence supporting this. Without this, achieving PO3 and PO4 is difficult!

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the <u>Results Statistics</u> page of the AQA Website.