

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/11 Case Study 11
--

Key messages

Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates particularly definitions and calculations. Many candidates continue to confuse ethical behaviour with legal requirements, non-verbal communication with visual communication and profit with revenue.

The areas which require further attention include legal obligations and ethical considerations (**Sections 4.3** and **4.4.**), Market research considerations (**Sections 8.2**) and financial terms (**Section 6.3**). Additionally, candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering the pre release case study and potential calculations which may be completed using the information provided.

General comments

There was evidence that schools and candidates had focused upon the skills required to do well in **Section B** of the paper. However, candidates continued to find it challenging to gain the highest marks available in this section. This was generally due to a lack of application to their own enterprise project and a consideration of the importance of any financial information provided.

There are some considerations that might be helpful in enabling candidates to achieve their best marks in future exam sessions:

- Learn precise definitions for all key terms.
- Practise the calculations which are specified in **sections 6.3** and **6.4** of the specification.
- Read the whole question, including the stem carefully, taking note of the command word in the question and instructions such as to include an example.
- Within **section B** candidates should be encouraged to embed relevant examples from either the case study (**Question 6**) or their own enterprise (**Question 7**), in both their analysis and evaluations.
- Within **Question 6** candidates should be encouraged to make use of any financial information and calculations from questions in **Section A** to support any decisions made.
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7a** and **7b**, candidates should ensure that the examiner understands what actions the candidates took by providing relevant examples. An introductory paragraph describing the enterprise is not sufficient to show application.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This model was understood by the majority of candidates who were able to correctly identify the two stages. A lack of precise terminology meant that some candidates could not be rewarded for their answer.
- (b) Candidates found this to be a straightforward question. The strongest answers stated an enterprise skill from topic 3.1 of the specification followed by an example from the case study of how this skill was used. The mark scheme provides a number of examples of this approach. The weakest answers confused enterprise skills with the stages of the enterprise project and repeated their answers to **part (a)**. Such responses gained no credit.

- (c) (i) Candidates who scored highly on this question recognised that the target customer was parents and their children, therefore any change in these groups would affect the enterprise success. A small number of candidates wrote in very general terms that the population might not want books. As this related to social trends not population changes no credit could be given.
- (ii) This part of the question was less well understood than **part (c) (i)**. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question. The strongest responses recognised the importance of customers income to the purchase of this non-essential product.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates found it challenging to offer a precise definition of this term, such as those in the mark scheme. A common error being to confuse risk reducer with risk avoidance.
- (b) There was some evidence that candidates did not fully understand this question. A noticeable number of candidates wrote about problems they faced not the effect on their enterprise of an expected risk. The strongest answers identified a risk, often a financial issue, and then explained actions they took within the enterprise to avoid that risk occurring such as producing a financial budget. Precise reference to their own enterprise project gained the final mark.
- (c) The strongest responses stated two ethical actions as listed within topic 4.4, or provided practical examples of these such as paying fair wages. Many candidates confused ethics with legal requirements for example paying taxes or following copyright laws. These answers gained zero marks. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 3

- (a) Well understood by most candidates.
- (b) Candidates found this to be one of the most difficult questions on the paper. **Part (ii)** was better explained than **part (i)**. The strongest answers for **part (i)** recognised that as new entrepreneurs with limited finance the method of market research chosen needed to be low cost. In **part (ii)** successful answers explained that information from the correct target market would ensure appropriate decisions were made. Even the strongest answers were very general with no attempt at application to the candidate's enterprise project.
- (c) Candidates could answer this question in two ways either by identifying the method of research used and explaining how this helped the book enterprise or by stating the information located and the decisions made as a result. Candidates found it challenging to gain marks here, most gained one mark by correctly stating some information from the case study related to market research.

Question 4

- (a) This question was generally not well answered. Only some answers identified a suitable source of finance. Even the strongest found it challenging to use evidence from the case study to explain why the identified method would be suitable. The mark scheme shows an example of how this could be done. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (b) Lack of precision meant that many candidates could not be awarded marks for their answers. For example, candidates often wrote that 'fixed costs stay the same or do not vary', which is incorrect. Had they stated that these 'costs do not vary with output, but variable costs do', both marks would have been awarded.
- (c) The majority of candidates correctly calculated this figure. A small number of candidates identified the correct figure, but their working out showed that they had calculated profit rather than revenue. These answers could not be rewarded.
- (d) A small, but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this calculation. Those that did attempt the question frequently gained both marks.

Question 5

- (a) The term was generally understood with candidates offering a variety of correct, but imprecise answers. A mark of one was common.
- (b) This topic was generally well understood by those who attempted it. The most common correct answers being action and business plans. Candidates who did not gain reward on this question frequently stated enterprise terms or processes, such as SWOT, rather than a specific document. A number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) Candidates found it challenging to gain full marks on this question. Reasons why planning would require changing was not well understood by the majority of candidates. The strongest responses recognised that a potential answer was contained in the exam paper and stated that plans would need to be updated if external factors such as the population changed.
- (d) The most common correct answers were consultants, financial institutions and other entrepreneurs. A number of candidates did not carefully read the question and incorrectly provided examples of informal support.

Section B

It should be noted that in **Question 6** candidates can score highly by using the material in the case study, particularly any calculations to justify their choices. Within **Question 7** candidates should ensure that each paragraph of their answers relate directly to their enterprise project.

Question 6

- (a) The majority of answers were awarded marks within the bottom of Level 2. Most candidates focused their answers on descriptions of how the stakeholder was linked to the enterprise. For example, Mariam's mother was willing to lend the required finance. Only the strongest answers were developed to show good analysis by explaining the effect of this stakeholder on the enterprise. Most frequently this was a recognition that if the books did not appeal to the parents/children they would not buy them, and the enterprise would be forced to close.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the two options using evidence from the case study. Candidates who made use of the calculations from **Question 4c** and **4d** and their own calculations scored highly. The strongest responses often calculated the number of book sales required to break even or the potential profit to be gained from each option. Weaker answers mainly focused upon the overall cost of the options or the percentage of the selling price she would receive, gaining a mark at the bottom of Level 2.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates found this question to be the most challenging question on the paper. A number of candidates gained no marks because they discussed the advantages of posters. The strongest answers provided examples of how positive body language was used in their enterprise to ensure success. Most frequently the examples given were either of body language used to persuade customers or within the negotiation to show professionalism. A noticeable number of candidates did not answer this question.
- (b) Candidates were confused by this question. The strongest responses described how the identified objective could be applied to their enterprise using an example and gained a mark in Level 2. Candidates were unable to evaluate effectively by considering the ways in which their enterprise may not have been considered a success or how they could have used the identified measure to improve their future enterprise.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/12 Case Study 12
--

Key messages

It is important that candidates carefully read the questions and focus their answers on the questions set. There was evidence this session that candidates had not fully read the question before starting their answers. This was seen in the answers to **Questions 1(b), 2(b), 2(c) and 3(b)**.

Candidates should be reminded to take careful note of the focus for each question and if an example is required. A number of candidates did not gain marks by not providing examples to support their answers.

Within **Section B** candidates should be reminded that each paragraph should contain some evidence from either the case study or an example from their own enterprise experience.

When answering **Question 7** candidates will gain little reward for an introductory paragraph describing their enterprise. The emphasis should be on referring to their enterprise throughout their answer.

General comments

There was some evidence that candidates had not fully understood some of the topics which were tested on this paper. This was evident from the number of candidates who did not attempt some questions noticeably **Question 1(c), Question 3(d), Question 4(b), Question 4(c) and Question 5(d)**.

Many candidates continue to find it challenging with **Section B** questions to gain marks above Level 1. This was generally due to a lack of application to the case study, or their own enterprise project. This session candidates also misinterpreted the questions by ignoring the key word.

There are some considerations that might be helpful in enabling candidates to achieve their best marks in future exam sessions:

- Learn precise definitions for all key terms.
- Practise the calculations specified in **section 6.3** and **6.4** of the specification.
- Read the whole question taking note of key words and the requirement for examples.
- Within **section B** candidates should be encouraged to embed relevant examples from either the case study (**Question 6**) or their own enterprise (**Question 7**), in both their analysis and evaluations. Answers to calculations from **Section A** questions will often be useful evidence to support a discussion in **Questions 6(a) and 6(b)**.
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7a** and **7b**, candidates should ensure that the examiner understands what actions the candidates took by relevant examples throughout their answer. An introductory paragraph describing the enterprise is not sufficient to show application.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to accurately identify one of the features. Very few were able to offer clear and precise definitions.

- (b) Candidates found this to be the most challenging question on the exam paper. Many misunderstood the focus of the question and gained zero marks. The strongest answers recognised the key instruction was '*operating as a charity*' and therefore the requirement was to explain the advantages of this as a type of business organisation. Such candidates often explained the benefit of government grants or employee motivation. Weaker answers explained why a charity is helpful to society and therefore did not answer the question.
- (c) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. Successful candidates stated the stage of the enterprise process, as listed in topic 2.1 of the syllabus, and then provided an example from the case study material of actions that illustrated this stage being completed. A common error made by some candidates was to identify market research as a stage in the process or to explain enterprise skills.

Question 2

- (a) The vast majority of candidates correctly answered this question gaining 2 marks.
- (b) Candidates found this question to be straightforward. Weaker responses often ignored the instruction 'other than those in table 1' or gave examples of headings found in a business plan.
- (c) The strongest answers explained how a particular type of planning was used in the candidate's enterprise and how this was beneficial. The most common correct answers explained the benefit of budgeting in avoiding overspending or action plans in ensuring all tasks were completed on time. A significant number of candidates simply described a type of plan ignoring the key instruction to explain how the plan helped the enterprise.

Question 3

- (a) This definition was generally well understood with many candidates gaining at least one mark. A mistake made by some candidates was to confuse market research with marketing.
- (b) This question required candidates to explain the specific advantage of a survey as a method of research. The question included the name of one of the entrepreneurs from the case study and therefore the answer should explain the benefits to this entrepreneur. A mistake made by many candidates was to describe features of a survey or how it could be conducted therefore not answering the question. Stronger responses offered many of the answers contained in the mark scheme.
- (c) Very few candidates were able to gain full marks on this question, a mark of one or two was common. Those that did often explained that Emma had little finance and therefore could not afford to waste money on research that did not provide sufficient information. Weaker answers stated that research would prevent failure without explaining why. Such answers could therefore not be credited.
- (d) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest answers frequently stated that they should offer more activities with no development. Some candidates confused customer retention with attracting new customers. These candidates often suggested either increased advertising or reducing the price for new customers.

Question 4

- (a) This topic area was well understood by many candidates who were able to offer clear and precise definitions. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (b)(i) Well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (ii) Many candidates gained 3 of the 4 marks available by correctly calculating the break-even amount. The strongest answers recognised that it would be impossible for the film club to sell 511.11 tickets and therefore it was necessary to round up to a whole number of 512 tickets. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) The question required candidates to calculate the correct fixed costs for the film club activity and compare this to the fixed cost of tennis lessons. Candidates who recognised this gained full marks.

Many candidates were able to recognise that a cost had been ignored but were unsure how to develop their answer to gain all three marks. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates offered two correct examples. Some candidates incorrectly stated examples of stakeholders which were incorrect or too vague for credit. Often this was teachers who are internal stakeholders (workers) or parents, who are customers.
- (b) The majority of candidates gained one mark on this question by identifying a benefit such as those in the mark scheme. Only the strongest responses were able to develop their answer to explain why this would be beneficial. The best answers used a clear example of a communication that happened within their enterprise project with a named stakeholder. Weaker answers did not gain the application mark by talking in general terms about a stakeholder such as suppliers or owners.
- (c) Candidates generally understood that emails have a disadvantage of perhaps being lost or not opened by the recipient. As with **part (b)** above, very few candidates were able to give a specific example from their own experience to support their answer. A mark of one was common.
- (d) The strongest answers identified a document, often an agenda or business plan. They then explained clearly how this was used in their meeting with an example of the meeting and its purpose. Weaker responses often stated that they would use a negotiation plan, which would be used to organise before the meeting rather than used within it.

Section B

Candidates scored most highly in **Question 6a** where they were required to make use of the case study evidence in their answer. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt either part of **Question 7** perhaps suggesting poor time management.

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question. Most frequently these gained a mark at the top of Level 2 by offering examples of how the skills had been used by Emma. The strongest responses often explained Emma's determination and taking the initiative. The mark scheme shows examples of these answers. To gain a mark in Level 3 the candidates needed to show the impact of these actions. A number of candidates incorrectly stated that Emma had chosen to have a telephone meeting. This was the decision of both Emma and Luca and therefore was not an example of her problem solving. The weakest answers gained a mark in Level 1 by describing the meaning of each of the attributes or characteristics with no application to the case study.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates selected posters and social media as the methods to analyse. Candidates who gained a mark in Level 3 or 4 used the evidence in the case study to justify their choice. Such candidates recognised the importance of the cost of the method for this charity with limited finance and its suitability for the young audience targeted. Candidates who gained marks in Level 1 often described in detail how a poster would be drawn with no reference to the case study material. Many candidates were confused by the suggestion of sponsorship of a sports team. These candidates often thought that the sports team would sponsor the charity. Centres would benefit from further time spent looking in detail at the different methods of marketing communications and their benefits and costs.

Question 7

- (a) This question was not well attempted by many candidates. A key issue which limited candidates' answers was a misunderstanding of the question. Candidates ignored the key word 'affected' in the question. A mark in Level one was therefore common as candidates effectively described the different objectives but did not answer the question set. There were however, some very strong answers. The most successful candidates gained marks in Level three by providing specific examples of actions they had taken in order to meet their objectives and the impact that this had on the way the enterprise operated. The mark scheme provides examples of this approach. A number of candidates confused revenue and cash-flow with profit. These candidates showed a lack of understanding of terminology and therefore often gained a mark in the bottom of Level one.

- (b)** Many candidates found it challenging to answer this question effectively. The strongest responses described a law or regulation briefly, and then explained in detail the actions they had been forced to take to meet this regulation. Most commonly this was through examples of items bought to meet health and safety requirements. The explanation of the impact of these increased costs on the price charged or profit made took the answer to Level 3. Very few candidates attempted the two sided approach needed to gain Level 4. Those that did often wrote effectively about the positive impact that maintaining health and safety had on their number of sales. Weaker answers frequently started with an opening paragraph describing their enterprise but did not refer to their enterprise at any other stage in the answer. Candidates should be reminded that each paragraph of their answer should contain some reference to their enterprise project.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13 Case Study 13
--

Key messages

Centres should encourage candidates to focus directly and clearly upon the entire question being asked. There was clear evidence that some candidates had not read the question fully before starting their answers. In some cases, this meant that very good answers scored no marks as they did not answer the question set. This was an issue in **Questions 2(a)** and **3(c)**.

Some areas of the syllabus were not well understood by candidates particularly sponsorship (**Question 4c**), the process of negotiation (**Question 5b**) and venture capital (**Question 5c**).

Candidates continue to find it challenging to gain the highest marks available in questions which require application of knowledge to both the case study and their own enterprise project. Candidates would benefit from spending more time before the examination applying the concepts and issues in the case study to their own enterprise project.

General comments

Candidates who scored highly had clearly made good use of their preparation time before the examination to thoroughly examine the case study material.

There are some considerations that might be helpful in enabling candidates to achieve their best marks in future exam sessions:

- Candidates should be encouraged to learn precise definitions of key terms within the syllabus.
- Read the whole question, including the stem carefully, taking note of the command word in the question and instructions such as whether an example is required.
- Candidates should be encouraged to make effective use of any calculations produced in **section A** questions to support their analysis in **Questions 6 (a)** and **(b)** if required.
- Within **section B** candidates should be encouraged to embed relevant examples from either the case study (**Question 6**) or their own enterprise (**Question 7**), in both their analysis and evaluations.
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7a** and **7b**, candidates should ensure that the examiner understands what actions the candidates took by providing relevant examples. Each paragraph of the answer should relate directly to their own enterprise project.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were not always confident in their understanding of these two terms. A lack of precision in language meant that some candidates could not be awarded the marks. For example, a number of candidates stated that **customers** only shop in this store. Although this is an explanation of a loyal customer it does not show a characteristic that identifies this as different from a consumer. The term consumer was not understood by a noticeable number of candidates.
- (b) Candidates often gained one of the three marks available as they were able to identify a relevant quote, usually that worksheets were copied. Had the candidates explained the effect on Nora's

enterprise such answers could have gained all three marks. The most common correct impact being the enterprise closed down or Nora lost confidence in the enterprise.

- (c) Generally, not a well understood term. Many candidates gained one mark by showing some imprecise understanding.
- (d) The strongest answers were able to identify a method of measuring satisfaction, often the number of sales or complaints. Very few candidates developed their answer to show how this could be applied to the instructions sheet enterprise.

Question 2

- (a) The strongest answers recognised that with high risk would be potential high rewards. The weakest answers did not answer the question set but defined the term risk gaining zero marks.
- (b)(i)(ii) The majority of candidates found **part (i)** to be the most straightforward question on the examination paper. Candidates were less successful at identifying examples from the case study material for social and technological factors. The most common correct answers were increased use of online tutorials for social and better access to the internet for technological. A number of candidates did not attempt **part (ii)**.
- (c) Candidates showed a good understanding of this topic with some clear examples of legal obligations. The strongest responses often made good use of the case study (which was not required in this question) and explained how copyright would limit the products that entrepreneurs could copy. Weaker answers did not identify a legal obligation or regulation and therefore provided answers which were too vague to be credited.

Question 3

- (a) A well answered question by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Candidates took two different but equally correct approaches to answering this question. They either explained how achieving the objective affected their enterprise or the actions they took in order to achieve the objective they wanted. Weaker answers gained one mark by identifying a potential objective and applying this to the case study rather than their own enterprise. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question
- (c) There was evidence that many candidates were not carefully reading this question. Such candidates described in detail a potential problem for Nora in her enterprise, but this was not related to market research and therefore gained no credit. Stronger responses recognised that Nora had completed only secondary research which would limit the relevance of the results to her enterprise. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.

Question 4

- (a) Generally, well answered with a range of correct answers being presented and applied to the case study material.
- (b) Candidates found it challenging to gain full marks on this part of the question. A mistake made by some candidates was to state vague one word answers such as timing. The strongest answers focused on the factors listed in topic 8.4 of the syllabus.
- (c) The majority of candidates were unclear on the meaning of sponsorship and as a result very few were able to gain a mark on this question. Many candidates produced very general answers related to communication. Those that did understand the term often thought that Nora would be sponsored to promote other businesses. The question asked how Nora could use sponsorship as a method of marketing communication, therefore she would be paying to sponsor a business in order to have them promote her enterprise.

Question 5

- (a) Candidates had a general awareness of the term negotiation and incorrectly described the meaning of the term not the factors to consider, gaining zero marks. The strongest answers often stated the language to use or the evidence that could be used to support their case.
- (b) Candidates were not aware of the process of completing a negotiation and therefore often found it hard to explain what they did during their own negotiation. A mark of zero was very common. Many produced vague answers such as 'we planned' or 'prepared counter arguments' showing some awareness but too brief for credit.
- (c) This was the most challenging question on the exam paper for many candidates and a significant number did not attempt to answer it. Many candidates thought that venture capital was reinvested profit. A small number of candidates recognised that venture capital had something to do with risk but were unable to relate this to investment funding. Only the strongest answers were able to gain a mark.
- (d) Strong answers identified a sources of finance and used details from their own enterprise to explain why this would be a suitable source for the enterprise. Weaker answers gained one mark by identifying a source of finance which may not be suitable for a candidates' enterprise project.

Section B

A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt some questions in this section. This may be a timing issue as **Question 7a** and **7b** were frequently not attempted. Candidates would benefit from time spent before the examination applying the concepts in the case study to their own enterprise experience.

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question, although the majority were awarded marks towards the bottom of Level 2. The strongest answers identified points in the case study which were used to show how each document was used. Most frequently this was the business plan identifying the risk of material being copied and shared. Weaker responses described the contents of the documents with no attempt to link them to the case study enterprise. Such answers gained a mark in Level 1.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the most suitable business organisation for Nora's enterprise. Stronger responses recognised that Nora had already failed with one enterprise and may therefore benefit from the advice of a more experienced partner. Such answers gained marks in Level 2. Candidates who moved to level three explained the benefits or costs to Nora's enterprise of this extra expertise. Usually this was a simple statement that she would be making very little profit and therefore sharing with a partner would reduce this amount too much making the enterprise not worthwhile. Many candidates did not produce a two-sided answer considering the positive and negative aspects of each type of business organisation for this entrepreneur.

Question 7

- (a) To gain a mark in Level 3 on this question candidates needed to explain how technology either assisted or hindered the operation of their enterprise. The most successful candidates identified a piece of technology, explained how this was used in their enterprise activity and then the benefit this created. For example, a candidate explained that using Instagram to advertise their enterprise saved them time which they then used to make a better quality product which ensured they made sales. A number of candidates provided general answers such as 'we were online so got more customers'. As no technology or explanation was developed, such answers scored at the bottom of Level 1. Candidates should be reminded that when reading their answers to **Question 7**, examiners should learn something about their enterprise project. Some good answers to this question could not move to the top of the level as the answers were generic rather than focused on their enterprise.
- (b) Candidates found this to be the most challenging question on the examination paper. Even the strongest answers often gained a mark in Level 1. A noticeable number of candidates made no attempt to answer the question. The strongest responses provided examples of communications they had used with different stakeholders and then explained the benefit or cost of this method.

The most successful often chose marketing communications such as posters. As with **part (a)** some candidates did not specify a method of communication, simply stating the internet. Such answers were too vague and therefore could not gain credit.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02 Coursework

Key messages

- Candidates must use the correct syllabus for the year of examination. This is to ensure work submitted matches the relevant task descriptors so candidates can access the full range of marks.
- Marks for analysis and evaluation continue to be awarded generously. Candidates must provide detailed explanations to develop and justify points made using connectives such as 'this means' and 'therefore' which can help add depth to their observations.
- Application involves clearly linking each point made to their chosen project rather than provide theoretical points.
- Assessors are required to annotate the coursework using the assessment criteria. This shows how and why a particular mark is being awarded.
- Candidates continue to select appropriate and interesting projects.

General comments

- To access the full range of marks, candidates must provide full evidence for each task. **Section 4** of the syllabus provides clear guidance about what candidates must submit. There is no need to produce additional materials including business plans as there are no marks available for them.
- Good knowledge was shown in the coursework, but there are limited marks available for this skill. To do well, candidates must show application, analysis and evaluation skills.
- Most candidates struggled to develop points effectively. A list of points or a description of what they did is not analysis. Good analysis means developing points to show the consequences of an action. For example, because X happened, which (could) lead to Y, and therefore Z.
- Application remains limited. Candidates need to explain how theory is relevant to their project by providing clear examples from the project as evidence to support the knowledge. For example, mentioning what they are selling or using numbers, (e.g. financial, market research) to link the point to their individual project.
- A decision is not evaluation. Candidates must provide a clear supported reason, using evidence from their project, to support all decisions made. To access the higher mark bands, good analysis and evaluation must be shown throughout the relevant tasks. The school Support Hub includes skills exercises to help learners develop their application, analysis and evaluation skills.
- Most candidates exceeded the word limit for **task 1** and **4**. While they are not currently penalised for this, it is important candidates present their work in a clear and precise way. It is the quality of what is written, not the quantity, that matters.
- Assessors should annotate the work to show where and which skill is being awarded. For example, writing 'AO1', 'AO2' and 'AO3' or comments such as 'good analysis' at appropriate points. This should be done on the work itself, at the point of award. Most centres did not do this despite it being a Cambridge requirement.
- Some centres did not include both the highest and lowest marked work in the sample. If missing, this can cause delays to the moderation process, and can affect when results are released to centres.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1

The work was presented in a report format. Most candidates identified advantages and disadvantages for two ideas and gathered market research. Better responses focused on two or three key points for each option and explained why each one was significant, either in a positive or negative way. Such responses also reviewed market research data to explain what the results showed.

Only the strongest responses used the market research data to support decisions made. When making a final decision, candidates could quote the results from their market research to help explain why the chosen option was better than the alternative. Weaker responses listed theoretical points or included charts showing their market research but did not comment on the results.

Task 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify two significant issues. Some included more than three problems, which was unnecessary. For each problem, better responses explained what the problem is, why it is a problem, what would happen if not managed and then outlined how they planned to manage each problem. Only the best responses offered two detailed solutions for each problem which is needed to access Level 3.

Some candidates continue to present their work as a risk assessment. This should be strongly discouraged as this format includes complex information such as the severity and likelihood of risk, which is unnecessary. It also does not allow candidates to explain problems and solutions in detail.

Others described actions taken retrospectively. Candidates should be reminded this is a planning activity so the work must be forward looking – focusing on what they might do to solve each problem, not simply explaining what they did.

- (b) Most candidates provided written evidence explaining possible sources of finance or methods of marketing communication. The best responses developed points in context to show why each option might be appropriate (or not) for their project. Weaker responses stated general advantages and disadvantages but did not attempt to link the theory to their project. Without good contextual references throughout the written element, candidates cannot access Level 3.

The second part of this task is a presentation outlining their proposals for finance or marketing communications. The assessed element for this task is the witness statement, which must be signed by the teacher. The witness statement should focus on communication and enterprise skills shown by the individual during the presentation. Most witness statements focused on the content. Where skills were named, there were limited or no details outlining what the candidate did to demonstrate them. A tick on the witness statement is not sufficient evidence. Other statements detailed skills used during the project rather than in the presentation. Some did not include a signed witness statement, which automatically limits the work to Level 1.

Task 3

This task was generally well attempted. Most candidates referred to negotiation as one of the five skills, and the best responses included detailed plans for negotiation.

The strongest responses included relevant examples to show how they had used each of the named enterprise skills. A common mistake was to explain why the skill was important. Some referred to what 'we' did, when they needed to focus on their own personal actions. Others named a skill, but the example related to a different skill. Without relevant examples of individual skills shown, the skill does not count towards the five needed. Candidates need to include appropriate examples for at least three skills to access Level 2.

Task 4

All candidates presented their work in a report format. Candidates should be reminded that they are only required to submit a 1000 word report, so having a clear focus is essential.

The marking of this task was generous. **Task 4** is challenging as it only assesses AO3 – analysis and evaluation. Candidates are required to discuss the positive and negative outcomes of two areas – one area must be planning and implementation. Only the strongest responses attempted to analyse key issues. Most reviewed every action taken which encouraged description, not analysis. Such an approach is likely to limit the work to Level 2.

Most responses did not indicate whether points made represented a positive or negative outcome. Including a simple subheading, namely positive outcome or negative outcome, would be helpful. Candidates only need to focus on one significant positive outcome and one negative outcome for each area. Each point should be

developed, using phrases such as ‘therefore’, or ‘this means’. This can help candidates develop their observations to explain why it was important and how it affected their project.

Many candidates did offer simple conclusions and make recommendations for improvement. However, only a small number of candidates used evidence collected to support their conclusions. Any evidence used should be clearly referenced and used to clearly support the point being made. If the material is not relevant, it should not be included.