

Internal assessment SL, sample C

Assessment criteria	Marks awarded	Marks available
Criterion A	3	4
Criterion B	4	5
Criterion C	4	5
Criterion D	2	3
Criterion E	3	4
Criterion F	2	2
Criterion G	2	2
Total	20	25

Examiner comments

Criterion A – Supporting documents

The 3 supporting documents are relevant and sufficient in depth: however, they do not provide the range of views needed to score 4 marks (as is often the case when SL candidates choose only 3 documents, as that minimum quantity makes it more difficult, although not impossible, to score full marks).

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

There is an appropriate selection of business management tools, techniques and theories, such as the eight Ps and SWOT analysis. They are suitably applied, though as the candidate covers so much (e.g. Starbucks mission statement and its ethos) the models are not always applied with enough depth (e.g. in the SWOT analysis on page 5, the one opportunity and the one threat are vague and generic).

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

There is an appropriate selection of data from the supporting documents with good analysis. Data from the three documents is well integrated in the commentary. For an even higher mark, the candidate should have better selected which data is useful and important, or not: for example, on page 3, is the historical background really needed to answer the commentary question?

Criterion D – Conclusions

The conclusions are consistent with the evidence presented; however, they do not fully answer the commentary question (as the question is “how have they...” and the candidate only concludes “yes, they have...”) Given that in terms of word count, the candidate could still write 150 more words, the conclusions could have been more developed, closing the loop on the commentary question – and scoring 1 more mark.

Criterion E – Evaluation

There is evidence of evaluation, judgements are substantiated (see footnotes for sources and references), yet not thoroughly and systematically.

Criterion F – Structure

The commentary is well organized and structured. The use of bold and italics adds to the clarity of the commentary.

Criterion G – Presentation

The commentary is very well presented in all respects (especially the list of appendices and the appendices themselves).