

Internal assessment SL, sample B

Assessment criteria	Marks awarded	Marks available
Criterion A	4	4
Criterion B	5	5
Criterion C	4	5
Criterion D	3	3
Criterion E	4	4
Criterion F	2	2
Criterion G	2	2
Total	24	25

Examiner comments

Criterion A – Supporting documents

The 5 supporting documents (clearly identified in the table of contents and all duly labelled and included at the end of the IA) are relevant and sufficient in depth. They provide a range of views and ideas. The candidate uses various types of documents (e.g. extract from the annual report of the organisation for financial statements, extract from a government report, extract from a consumer website).

Criterion B – Choice and application of tools, techniques and theories

The candidate chooses and applies a range of business management tools, techniques and theories, on three topics: finance (e.g. ratios), marketing strategy (e.g. Porter's generic strategies), globalization (e.g. references to international strategic alliances). The selection is broad and appropriate and the application is skilful.

Criterion C – Use and analysis of data and integration of ideas

The candidate uses the data from the supporting documents very well, with appropriate analysis, especially about the financial ratios. There is some integration of ideas: however, the discussion of the three broad themes of finance, marketing strategy and globalisation, means that it was not possible, within the word limit, to analyse them in much depth and to integrate all the ideas optimally (which is why the candidate cannot score even higher for criterion C).

Criterion D – Conclusions

The conclusion is logically based on the evidence provided on the previous pages. The very last sentence of the conclusion ("ultimately, USC should increase overseas

marketing”) shows that the commentary answers the question sharply and unambiguously.

Criterion E – Evaluation

There is thorough evidence of evaluation all along, as illustrated by comments such as “remains one of the smallest...” (page 1), “USC’s low level of gearing suggests that...” (page 2) or “therefore, this marketing strategy is especially applicable to...” (page 4). Judgments are substantiated with justifications, as much as can be expected within the word limit.

Criterion F – Structure

The commentary is well organized and structured.

Criterion G – Presentation

The overall presentation is very clear. It was particularly good to see how/where/when the supporting documents were used in the commentary (e.g. page 4: “In supporting document 4, it is stated that...”, page 4: “As is evident in supporting document 1...”)