

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/11 Case Study

Key messages

Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt some questions.

The areas which require further attention include topics:

- 4.3 legal obligations.
- 6.3 financial terms particularly calculations.
- 8.1 purpose of marketing – candidates continue to confuse marketing with market research.

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

Some candidates struggled with exam technique particularly developing knowledge points into explanation or analysis.

There was evidence that some candidates had not carefully read each question before starting their answers. This could be seen especially in **Questions 1(d), 4(a), 4(c) and 5(a)**.

Candidates provided answers that lacked the required application throughout the paper but particularly in Section B. In this section candidates should ensure that every paragraph of their answer contains either an example from the case study (**Questions 6a and 6b**) or from their own enterprise (**Questions 7a and 7b**).

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This term was understood by the majority of candidates who were able to correctly identify the two elements of a person and *starting/owning* an enterprise. A lack of precise terminology meant some candidates gained only one mark as they identified this as a person *managing* or running an enterprise.
- (b) As in previous exam sessions candidates were aware of the enterprise skills stated in topic 3.1 but often found it difficult to explain how entrepreneurs used these skills. Application marks were frequently not awarded. Candidates should be encouraged to name entrepreneurs they have studied as part of Topic 3.2 of the syllabus.
- (c) This term was not well understood by many candidates. Candidates who scored highly on this question recognised that such rules were set by an authority or government. Weaker answers confused regulations with legislation. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (d) Candidates found this to be the most challenging question in Section A. The strongest responses showed good understanding of topic 4.3 of the syllabus. Such candidates often explained the need

to protect against health and safety issues or discrimination. Weaker answers ignored the requirement to explain why these are needed and simply stated a regulation. Such answers gained no credit. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates understood the term government grant but they often found it difficult to answer the questions set. A common error being to explain how the business would use the grant. Stronger answers often focused on the benefit of helping new entrepreneurs to start their enterprise.
- (b) There was some evidence that candidates did not fully understand this question. A noticeable number of candidates described a grant not the disadvantages of Maria having one. The strongest answers recognised the problems of limited finance and a difficult application process. Even the strongest answers found it difficult to apply the answer to Maria's enterprise.
- (c) Many candidates who attempted the questions gained full marks. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this calculation.
- (d) Many candidates had clearly learnt the break-even formula. The majority of candidates who attempted the question correctly calculated this figure. Answers were often well laid out allowing the Examiner to follow the progression of the calculation.

Question 3

- (a) (i) Correctly answered by most candidates.
- (ii) Candidates found this to be a difficult question. The strongest answers identified a method of dealing with risks from topic 4.2 and then showed the impact this action had in their own enterprise project. Most successful answers focused upon research or planning. Even the strongest answers were often very general with no attempt at application to the candidate's enterprise project.
- (c) A mark of 1 was common. Candidates could identify an objective but often found it difficult to explain why this would be suitable for Maria's enterprise.

Question 4

- (a) The most able candidates identified a meetings document from Topic 10.2. Explaining the purpose of this document ensured the candidate gained the second mark available. Some candidates suggested unrelated documents, such as an action plan. As this document would not help the running of the meeting these answers gained zero marks.
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates. The strongest answers explained how a cash flow forecast or action plan would be used in enterprise. Several candidates stated a 'financial plan'. This answer was considered too vague for credit.
- (c) Many candidates correctly identified two sources of support. Only the most able however, gave an example of the support offered to their enterprise by the source identified. A mark of 2 was therefore common. There was evidence that some candidates were not reading this question carefully. Such candidates provided examples of financial sources of support.

Question 5

- (a) A mark of one was common in this question as candidates stated the research completed. Very few were able to explain any problem with the method identified. The weakest answers frequently did not answer the question and simply described the information Maria found.
- (b) This topic was not generally well understood by those who attempted the question. A noticeable number of answers focused on market research rather than marketing. Stronger answers gained one mark by identifying one of the factors listed in the mark scheme. Even the strongest answers found it difficult to apply their answers to the case study enterprise.
- (c) Candidates found this to be the most approachable part of **Question 5**. A mark of 2 was common however as candidates identified a method and explained how it could be applied to the gym

instructor enterprise. Even the strongest answers found it difficult to gain 3 marks as they often simply stated that this would attract customers with no explanation of how this would be done. The mark scheme provides an example of how this could have been stated in a way that gains all 3 marks.

Section B

Candidates this session were less confident in their ability to answer the questions in this section. Candidates found **Questions 7(a)** and **(b)** particularly challenging. A number of candidates did not attempt questions in this section of the paper.

Question 6

- (a) The majority of answers were awarded marks at the bottom of Level 2. This was achieved by candidates stating that the business plan could help Maria gain the bank loan she required. Candidates who explained how the information contained in the plan would help the bank manager to reach a decision gained a mark in Level 3. A number of answers simply described the contents of a business plan with no attempt at application to the case study material.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the two options using evidence from the case study. Candidates who made use of the information in the case study gained a mark within Level 2. Most frequently this was through recognising the different amounts of money or time that would be taken by each option. The strongest responses recognised the importance to Maria of starting the enterprise as quickly as possible or being able to earn income to repay any loan. Such answers often moved into Level 3. Weaker answers identified points from the case study material with no supporting commentary.

Question 7

- (a) This question focused upon the work that candidates completed for **Task 1** of their coursework. To gain a mark in Level 2 candidates needed to state a method that they used and describe either the information that they gained or how they used this method to choose the project. Candidates who were able to identify a strength or weakness of the method used moved their answer into Level 3. The weakest answers stated a method of market research with no attempt at application to decision making in their enterprise project.
- (b) Candidates were clearly aware of the different types of business organisation. Several candidates provided detailed lists of the advantages and disadvantages of each type. As these answers frequently were not applied to the candidate's enterprise project a mark of 2 in Level 1 was awarded. The strongest answers explained how the advantage helped, or could have helped, the enterprise project to succeed. The mark scheme shows an example of an answer that took this approach and which would have gained a mark in Level 3. As in previous exams even the strongest answers were unable to evaluate effectively by applying both advantages and disadvantages of the organisation type to their enterprise project.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/12 Case Study

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 evident in the answers to **Questions 1(a), 4(c), 5(a) and 5(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 because they did not provide 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.

General comments

This session a noticeable number of candidates did not attempt some parts of the questions. This suggests that candidates were not confident in their understanding of the terms or the topics contained in the questions. Questions which candidates found difficult were **Question 1(d), Question 3(b), Question 3(c), Question 4(c), Question 5(b) and Question 6(b)**.

Many candidates continue to find it difficult to gain marks above Level 1 in **section B** questions. This is generally due to a lack of application to the case study, or their own enterprise project.

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 providing 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 state two communications. A small number of candidates ignored the instruction 'other than leaflets' and gained zero.
- (b) Candidates who gained both marks often identified cost and time as the factors. Weaker answers provided points which were not clearly related to marketing communication such as the type of business. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) Although candidates were aware of leaflets they often found it difficult to explain the advantages of this method of marketing. A mark of one was common with candidates identifying that a leaflet could be cheap to produce. Many candidates incorrectly stated features of a leaflet such as they

are tangible items or they can contain an image. Alone these are not benefits of leaflets and therefore gained no credit.

- (d) Candidates found it difficult to effectively answer this question. The strongest answers often focused on plagiarism or the requirement to be truthful when advertising. A large number of answers focused incorrectly on the impact of not abiding by laws therefore not answering the question set. A noticeable number of candidates made no attempt at an answer.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates gained one mark by recognising that this term refers to people interested or affected by an enterprise. Very few candidates gained the second mark for a complete and precise definition. A small number of candidates confused stakeholders with shareholders.
- (b) Candidates found this question to be straightforward. Weaker responses often ignored the instruction to 'use an example' and gained one of the three marks available. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) Generally, well answered. Some candidates stated that secondary research is inaccurate or false. Such answers were too vague to be credited.
- (d) The majority of candidates were able to identify a method of market research. Sometimes an example was provided to show how this was used in the candidate's enterprise. Frequently candidates did not explain how the method explained helped in making a decision. A mark of one or two was therefore common.

Question 3

- (a) This calculation was generally well understood with many candidates gaining full marks.
- (b) The strongest answers recognised that the figures given for price and costs were for 100 leaflets. Candidates who did not recognise this were able to achieve 3 of the 4 marks available by calculating 200 rather than 20 000 leaflets. However, for many candidates this was the most difficult question on the paper. Many candidates who did attempt the calculation found it difficult to gain a mark. A significant number of candidates did not attempt the question.
- (c) Candidates found this to be a very difficult question. The strongest answers identified that electricity, power or fuel costs had been omitted and explained why one of these would be required for the printing or deliveries. A noticeable number of answers simply stated an item from table 2, usually ink and paper, and did not answer the question. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.

Question 4

- (a) (i) Most candidates answered this question correctly.
- (ii) Although candidates had some awareness of the disadvantages of their stated business organisation many found it difficult to explain why this was a disadvantage. The strongest responses explained how the limited methods of finance were a particular problem for Zac as he had few savings and a certain level of costs to pay.
- (b) (i) The strongest answers recognised that Zac would lose sales as technology would allow firms to produce their own marketing communications. A number of candidates confused advances in technology with changes in taste.
- (ii) This part of the question was less well understood than **part (i)**. Stronger responses recognised that businesses or Zac would need to design new products. Very few candidates could develop these points sufficiently to show the impact on Zac's enterprise. The weakest answers repeated points raised in **part (i)** usually falling sales.
- (c) The question required candidates to name a financial document and explain how it was used in their own enterprise project. Many candidates identified the document but then described its contents with no reference to their enterprise. These answers could gain a maximum of one mark.

Some candidates did not read the question carefully and stated planning rather than financial documents. Such answers could not be credited. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates offered two correct examples. Some candidates incorrectly stated potential types of loans such as mortgages or family and friends.
- (b) Candidates found this to be a difficult question. Stronger responses gained one mark by identifying advice or storing money/savings for future use. Even the strongest answers had difficulty with explaining their points. Some candidates did not fully read the question. These candidates explained the benefits of loans being provided. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (c) Candidates generally understood the disadvantage of buying a used printer. Many gained full marks on this part of the question. Weaker answers were aware of the danger of the machine breaking but could not develop this point to gain the application and analysis marks available.
- (d) The strongest answers recognised the importance of the documents suggested in the case study to the negotiation. Weaker responses were vague and usually focused on the provision of a financial document. Such candidates found it difficult to explain why the document would assist the negotiation or apply it to the negotiation with Zac's parents.

Section B

Candidates scored most highly in **Question 7a** where they were required to apply their answer to their own enterprise project. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt **Question 6b** suggesting perhaps a lack of understanding of financial data.

Question 6

- (a) The strongest answers were able to link the production of a business plan with the likely success of the negotiation with Zac's parents. Such answers gained a mark at the bottom of Level 2. Very few candidates, however, were able to develop their discussion to explain how the plan would help to persuade Zac's parents to invest. Candidates who could do this moved their answer into the top of Level 2. A mark within Level 1 was common as many candidates simply described the contents of a business plan with no attempt at application to the case study.
- (b) Candidates found this to be the most difficult question in **Section B**. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest answers gained a mark in Level 3 by using their calculations of break-even output to analyse if the enterprise could produce and sell sufficient quantities. Many candidates however were confused by the numerical information provided. A significant number of candidates incorrectly stated that \$399.80 was the total expense rather than total revenue.

Question 7

- (a) The best answers described the method of competition and explained using an example how this method worked within their enterprise project. Weaker answers described the method but were unable to provide examples of how it operated. Frequently such answers could have moved from Level 1 into Level 3 simply by explaining how the method attracted customers. A good example alone could move descriptive answers into Level 2.
- (b) Candidates who chose creativity and time management scored higher marks. Such answers often provided practical examples of how their enterprise was successful because their product, or advertising, was creative. Many candidates showed a lack of understanding of delegation and practical skills. Delegation was often confused with assigning tasks to different members of the management team in an action plan. The weakest answers frequently described how the candidate used practical skills to make a product then stated that practical skills were unimportant within their enterprise.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13 Case Study

Key messages

Candidates continue to find examination style difficult which is limiting their ability to gain the higher marks in each question.

Centres should encourage candidates to read the question carefully and 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 answers which showed some good knowledge scored zero as they did not answer the question set. This was an issue in **Questions 2(c), 3(d), 4(d) and 5(d)**.

In **Section B** questions candidates should be encouraged to ensure that there is an example from either the case study (**Question 6a** and **Question 6b**) or their own enterprise project (**Question 7a** and **7b**) in every paragraph of their answer.

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. It was clear that some candidates had considered potential calculations and their importance before the examination.

Some areas of the syllabus were not well understood by candidates particularly ethical behaviour and non-verbal communication.

A noticeable number of candidates when answering **Questions 6(a)** and **6(b)** copied large sections of the case study into their answers. Candidates should be reminded that short pieces of evidence should be used to support the point they are trying to make.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Generally, well answered. The most common correct answers being profit and positive reviews.
- (b) Candidates often gained one of the two marks available as they were able to identify a relevant purpose of an action plan. To gain the second mark candidates needed to explain the impact of this on the enterprise. Very few candidates managed to do this. A noticeable number of candidates thought incorrectly that an action plan shows enterprise aims and objectives.
- (c) (i) The majority of candidates were able to gain two of the three marks available by recognising that the cartoons may become unpopular. Had the candidates explained that this would lead to falling revenue or sales the third mark would have been awarded.
 - (ii) The impact of this change was less well understood than the one in **part (i)** and a noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question. The strongest answers identified that people may be less willing or able to pay for items. Very few candidates developed their answer to show the impact of this on Adam's enterprise.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates found this to be the most straightforward question on the examination paper. Almost all gained both marks.
- (b) The strongest answers stated an attitude to risk, explained the meaning of the term and then provided a practical example from their enterprise project to support this attitude. The most successful explained how as a risk reducer they used research to lower risk. The weakest answers did not state an attitude and therefore could gain no marks.
- (c) Candidates were generally able to identify the research methods stated in the case study material. Some candidates however were confused by the question. These candidates described primary and secondary research rather than stating the methods Adam used.
- (d) Candidates showed an understanding of social media but very few were able to explain a specific benefit of this method of communication. A noticeable number of candidates stated that this would attract customers. As this is the purpose of all marketing communication such answers were considered too vague to be credited. The most common correct answer awarded was that this method reaches people globally. Candidates who recognised that Adam already has a blog were more successful. Even the strongest answers find it difficult to explain why this would be an advantage to Adam.

Question 3

- (a) This term was not well understood. The majority of answers gained one mark by showing awareness that this relates to moral values. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (b) Candidates continue to confuse ethical behaviour with legal requirements. The best answers focused on charity donations or the responsible removal of waste materials. A mark of one or zero was common. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (c) This term was generally understood with many candidates gaining at least one mark.
- (d) There was evidence that candidates were not carefully reading this question. Such candidates explained the actions they took in their negotiation. As the stages were not stated a mark of zero was awarded for these answers. Stronger responses named a stage but often find it difficult to develop their answers to gain the second mark for each point. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.

Question 4

- (a) Generally, well answered with a range of correct answers being stated. Some candidates misunderstood the question and gave examples of a particular type of document such as two examples of reports.
- (b) Candidates find it difficult to provide correct answers to this part of the question. A mistake made by some candidates was to state examples of written or visual communication.
- (c) The strongest answers explained the importance of being understood within a meeting. Candidates who gave a practical example from their own meetings gained all three marks. Several candidates gave an example of a meeting that they had attended but did not link this to formal communication. Such answers were not rewardable.
- (d) Candidates who were aware of the documents used to organise a formal meeting scored highly on this part of the question. Such candidates explained how the agenda or notice of the meeting could have helped Mary. Several candidates stated the problem, that Mary did not know what the meeting was about, but did not attempt to answer the question.

Question 5

- (a) The majority of candidates stated two correct answers. Some candidates identified 'financial forecasts' or 'cost sheets' which were too vague to receive credit.
- (b) Candidates were not always sure of the benefit of producing financial records. Those that gained a mark on this part of the question frequently explained how records could be used to calculate tax owed. Candidates find it difficult to apply their points to the enterprise in the case study.
- (c) Many candidates were able to correctly calculate this value. A small number confused cost and revenue calculations.
- (d) Strong answers identified a method, usually newspapers or posters. These answers then explained how a cartoon enterprise could use this method effectively to attract its target market. Weaker candidates ignored the instruction 'other than online' and described social media communications.

Section B

A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt **Question 7b**. This maybe a timing issue. As in previous sessions candidates often find it difficult to develop their knowledge points into applied analysis.

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 explained how Adam used creativity and practical drawing skills. Candidates who explained how Adam's use of a skill impacted his cartoon enterprise gained a mark in Level 3. The weakest answers identified correct pieces of application but assigned these to skills not directly related to those in the syllabus. Most frequently candidates who did this discussed communication or implementing skills. Such answers could not be rewarded.
- (b) This question required candidates to weigh up the evidence and evaluate the most suitable option for Adam's enterprise. Some candidates had clearly made effective use of their time before the examination to thoroughly assess the case study material. Such candidates made good use of the numerical data in the case study to calculate the potential profit and breakeven levels for one or both options. Others recognised that Adam would gain more potential income by selling his cartoons from his website. Those who also explained the dangers of this option gained a mark towards the top of Level 3 or bottom of Level 4. Some candidates attempted a two-sided answer but most frequently this was simply a statement that one option would give Adam freedom to produce what he wanted whilst the other would not. This was not sufficient to be considered as a justified decision.

Question 7

- (a) To gain a mark in Level 3 on this question candidates needed to explain how the ways stated could have been used in their enterprise project to assist its operation or success. The most successful identified actions they had, or could have, taken take as a result of the measurement. Many candidates simply described the measurement with no attempt to apply the method to their own enterprise. Candidates should be reminded that when reading their answers to **Question 7** Examiners should learn something about the candidate's enterprise project.
- (b) The strongest responses identified a source of support and explained the type of assistance offered by using an example. This style of answer gained a mark in Level 2. The most answers often focused upon the finance offered by parents or the advice and materials offered by schools. The weakest answers simply copied the material presented in the question stem and stated that advice was given without an example.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02 Coursework

Key messages

- It is essential that candidates 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.
- Analysis and evaluation marks continue to be awarded generously. Candidates must provide detailed explanations to develop and justify points made using connectives such as 'this means' and 'therefore' to add depth to their observations.
- Application involves clearly linking each point made to their chosen project rather than provide theoretical points.
- Assessors are expected to annotate the work, ideally using the assessment criteria, to show how and why a particular mark is being awarded.

General comments

- Candidates continue to select appropriate and interesting projects, which is pleasing to see. Popular project ideas include making and selling food or crafts, organising sports events and car washing enterprises.
- It is important to check that candidates are using the relevant syllabus for the year in which they take their examinations. Several candidates continue to use out-of-date syllabus resources, so the evidence presented for some tasks does not meet the relevant task descriptors. This will limit the marks that can be attained for affected tasks.
- 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 for each task. Candidates are strongly discouraged from producing additional materials including business plans as there are no marks available for them.
- Good knowledge was shown in all work, but it is important to remember there are limited marks available for this assessment objective. To do well, candidates must show application, analysis and evaluation skills.
- Most candidates struggle 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 was often limited. Candidates must explain how theory is relevant to their project by providing clear examples from the project as evidence to support the knowledge. For example, referring to 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.
- Work should be annotated to show where each 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 still do 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 causes delays to the moderation process and can affect when results are released to centres.

Comments on specific questions

Task 1

- Nearly all the work was presented in a report format. It was pleasing to see that most candidates could identify advantages and disadvantages for two ideas and gathered market research. Stronger 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. Weaker responses included market research charts but did not comment on the results, which limits the work to Level 1.
- Only the strongest responses used the results from their primary market research to support decisions made. Weaker responses tended to state points, or included charts for their market research but did not comment on the results. Without relevant discussion of the different options and respective market research the work cannot be considered for Level 2 and above.

Task 2(a)

- Most candidates could identify potential problems for their project. For each problem, stronger responses were able to describe the problem, explain why it could be a problem and what could happen if they did nothing about the problem. Most candidates could either identify or outline at least one way each problem could be managed. Only the strongest responses offered two detailed solutions for each problem and linked them to their project, which is essential to access Level 3. Candidates are reminded to include their action plan for reference purposes, but it should be noted that there are no marks for producing the action plan itself.
- Some 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.
- Other candidates presented 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, which is essential for Level 2 and 3 to be considered.

Task 2(b)

There are two parts to this task – a written component and a witness statement relating to a presentation.

- Most candidates provided written evidence explaining possible sources of finance or methods of marketing communication. The strongest 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 of the various methods or sources but did not attempt to link the theory to their project. Without good contextual references throughout the written element, the work cannot be considered for Level 3.
- Using words such as ‘at school’ is not sufficient to merit application. Examples might include explaining the amount of funds needed, or raised from each source, suitable references to what is being sold, whereabouts they are planning to sell their products – anything that clearly makes the method/source specific to their individual project.
- The witness statement, signed by the teacher, is the assessed element for the second part. This should focus on communication and enterprise skills shown by the individual during the presentation. Some 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 to merit Level 3. Some witness statements detailed skills used during the project rather than in the presentation. Others did not include a signed witness statement, which automatically limited the work to Level 1.

Task 3

- This task was generally well attempted. It was pleasing to see that most candidates referred to negotiation as one of the five skills, and the strongest responses included a detailed plan 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' or others in the group did, when they needed to focus on their own personal actions. Others named a skill, but the example related to a different skill.
- Not all the skills discussed were valid. For example, planning, organisation, customer service, financial management and marketing are not classed as enterprise skills in this syllabus. 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. Section 3.1 of the syllabus includes a list of common enterprise skills.

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.
- Many of the marks given for this task were generous. Task 4 is challenging as it only assesses AO3 - analysis and evaluation. Candidates are required to discuss positive and negative outcomes for two specified areas – one area must be planning and implementation. Only the strongest responses attempted to analyse key issues. Many reviewed what they did 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 should be reminded that they only need to discuss one positive outcome and one negative outcome for each area.
- Each point should be developed, using phrases such as 'therefore', or 'this means'. This should help candidates develop their observations to explain why it was important and how it affected their project. When awarding Level 4 and above, they could be using multiple connectives for each point being made – so show depth of analysis.
- 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, which is essential for Level 5 to be considered.
- Any evidence used should be clearly referenced and used to clearly support the point being made. If the material is not relevant, it does not need to be included in the report or appendix.