

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/11 Case Study

Key messages

Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates who displayed gaps in their knowledge particularly of definitions and enterprise models. This can be seen in **Section A** of the paper where candidates struggled to achieve marks on several questions. The areas which require further attention include 'The enterprise process' (Section 2.1), 'stages in the negotiation process' (Section 5.1), 'Financial terms', and 'Financial records' (Sections 6.3 and 6.4) and 'Measuring customer satisfaction and retention' (Section 8.3). Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering financial calculations and why documents are useful to an enterprise.

Many candidates continue to confuse 'Marketing communications' (Section 8.4) with 'Market research' (section 8.2). This was an issue in **Question 4(b)**. Additionally, omitting the requested examples hindered achievement within **Questions 3(c)** and **3(d)**.

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 struggle to gain the highest marks available in this section. This was generally due to a lack of application to their own enterprise project.

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

- learn precise definitions for all key terms
- practise the calculations which are specified in section 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
- when discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Questions 7(a)** and **7(b)**, 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) Many candidates were confused by this question and did not gain marks by incorrectly stating that they took responsibility for children or copying sections of the case study. Candidates who scored highly identified a way from section 1.2 of the specification and provided an example to explain how this could be used at school. The most successful candidates often used working as part of a team on a homework project as an example.

- (b) This question was not well answered by many candidates. The strongest answers identified a stage of the enterprise process as shown in section 2.1 of the syllabus, identified an action from the case study related to this stage and explained how it worked. The mark scheme provides an example of this approach. The weakest answers described market research or product development with no reference to stage 1 or 2 of the enterprise process. Such answers could not gain credit as it was unclear if candidates were explaining the enterprise process or a business plan.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates were generally not aware of the negotiation process which is covered in section 5.1 of the specification. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt the question. Weaker responses described elements of planning such as researching or conducting the negotiation, which did not answer the question set.
- (b) A well answered question. Many candidates correctly identified specific objectives that Mr Garcia might have such as those listed in the mark scheme.
- (c) There was some evidence that candidates had not carefully read this question. Although many candidates were aware of a variety of different aims most struggled to gain full marks on this question. A mark of 2 was common. Such candidates did not fully develop their explanation to show the affect the aim might have. The strongest responses were those listed in the mark scheme. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (d) The majority of candidates gained one mark by identifying that decreased taxes would reduce the costs of the enterprise or improve profit margins. A small number of candidates did not gain marks by simply stating that costs would be affected without stating the direction of the change.

Question 3

- (a) This question was answered well by many candidates. The most common correct answer being the chance of losing something because of a decision or action.
- (b) This question was answered very well by most candidates. Candidates made good use of the data provided to explain potential risks. The most common correct answer being the risk of not selling all the yearbooks ordered so making a loss.
- (c) The strongest answers used the information presented and identified that one way to reduce risk would be to print the yearbooks in school or complete further research, thus gaining 2 marks. To gain the third mark candidates needed to explain how this would reduce the risk such as by explaining that they would only produce the number ordered.
- (d) The strongest responses identified a legal obligation and explained the impact on their enterprise with a clear example. Most frequently candidates focussed upon health and safety requirements due to Covid. The mark scheme shows an example of a successful answer which focussed upon another aspect of safety. The weakest responses ignored the key words '*effect on your enterprise project*' and simply described legal obligations. Such answers could gain a maximum of one mark. A small number of candidates confused legal (government set) obligations with school rules and regulations.

Question 4

- (a) (i) This part of the specification was not well understood. Only the strongest answers provided a clear definition of the term.
- (ii) The majority of candidates were clearly unaware of this method of measuring customer satisfaction. A significant number of candidates chose not to attempt this question. Those that did attempt to answer often gained one mark for being aware that this was a person who pretended to be a customer.
- (b) Candidates provided a range of correct answers. The weakest answers confused marketing communications with market research and gained zero marks. The strongest answers explained

why the chosen method would be appropriate for a school-based enterprise. The mark scheme provides an example of such an answer.

Question 5

- (a) (i) This calculation was not well understood by most candidates. Most candidates attempted unsuccessfully to explain the general meaning of the phrase *to contribute to something*.
- (ii) Although most candidates were unable to explain the meaning of the term a larger amount were able to accurately calculate the figure and gained full marks on this part of the question. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this calculation.
- (iii) As with **part (a)(ii)** a significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. Some candidates confused breakeven with margin of safety or profit.
- (b) (i)–(iii) These calculation questions based around the information provided within the pre-seen case study were generally not well understood. A significant number of candidates did not attempt any of the calculations. Centres would benefit from greater time spent practising calculations and analysing the financial documents which are identified in sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the specification.

Section B

As in previous years candidates' scored more highly in **Questions 6(a)** and **6(b)** which both related to the case study. **Questions 7(a)** and **7(b)** require candidates to embed examples from their own enterprise experience throughout their answers. It should be noted that very little, if any, credit is given to candidates who write an introductory paragraph describing their enterprise experience. This year a small number of candidates did not attempt questions in this section.

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question, although the majority were awarded marks within the bottom of level 2. The strongest responses recognised teachers had little experience of producing a yearbook and that YB4U were focussed upon sales not assisting students. Weaker responses were able to describe sources of advice but were unable to analyse the suitability in this situation. A small number of candidates had clearly prepared for **Question 6(b)** but incorrectly presented their arguments for which option Guilleary should select as a response to **Question 6(a)**, such answers could not be credited.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the benefits and costs of each option before coming to a decision. The strongest answers gained marks within level 3 by using the information within the case study to justify their points. Such candidates often made effective use of their calculations from **Question 5** to support points. The weakest answers simply copied material from the case study labelling this a cost or benefit. Such answers gained marks at the bottom of level 2.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss examples from their own enterprise project. Candidates were required to show understanding of the importance of different language styles in two different types of communications. Many candidates struggled to gain marks above level 1. Such candidates often simply identified the difference between formal and informal communications, stating examples of each. The most successful responses gained marks in level 3 by providing specific examples of the style of language used in communications for their enterprise project. These examples were developed to show why this language was required. The mark scheme shows examples of such answers.
- (b) Many candidates struggled to answer this question and simply described each of the bullet points presented in the question. The strongest answers identified the purpose of their meeting or presentation. They then chose two of the bullet points in the question and explained both what they did and why they did it. For example, '*as part of our preparation we produced detailed forecasts of our projected income which allowed the school to see if we were likely to pay back any loans*'. Such candidates then linked this information to the success of the meeting by for example stating, '*as a result we were successful and they gave us the loan*'.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/12 Case Study

Key messages

Candidates clearly struggled with the concepts covered in **Questions 2(d), 5(d) and 7(b)** of this paper. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt these questions. Additionally, some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates. The areas which require further attention include Finance (Section 6) and Planning (Section 7). Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering these sections practicing financial calculations and discussing why documents are useful to an enterprise.

Many candidates continue to not provide clear examples within questions when guided to do so. This was an issue within **Questions 1(c), 2(c), 2(d), 4(c) and Section B** questions.

General comments

Many candidates continue to struggle to gain marks in level 2 in **Section B** questions. This was generally due to a lack of application to the case study or their own enterprise project.

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

- learn precise definitions for all key terms
- practise calculations which are specified in section 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
- when discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Questions 7(a) and 7(b)**, 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) Many candidates were able to accurately state two reasons why needs or wants would change gaining both marks available.
- (b) A mark of 1 was common for this question as many candidates identified but did not explain the method used. The most common correct answer being to produce a questionnaire or survey. Candidates who then explained how this survey was conducted within their enterprise gained the additional application mark available.

- (c) A range of correct answers were provided for this question. The strongest answers identified examples from the case study and used these to explain how Mr Barney used the identified skills. Several candidates incorrectly stated generic rather than the entrepreneurial skills stated in section 3.1 of the specification. Such candidates often identified communication incorrectly as an enterprise skill.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates were generally aware of the contents of a business plan and correctly identified two relevant points. A small number of candidates did not gain marks by simply stating '*research*'. Such answers were considered too vague for credit as they could apply to a variety of plans not just the business plan.
- (b) There was some evidence that candidates had not carefully read this question and confused it with the business plan tested in **part (a)**. Such candidates often referred to the overall aims and objectives of the enterprise or research completed. The most successful candidates often stated the task or person responsible. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) Although many candidates were able to identify the purpose of an action plan even the most able struggled to gain all the marks available for this question. Candidates often provided an example from their action plan but could not explain how this helped the project. The mark scheme provides an example of a successful way to do this. A mark of 1 or 2 was common.
- (d) This was a difficult question for many candidates. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt the question. The strongest responses had identified that a checklist was produced which was completed after every task. Mention of a task related to the candidate's own enterprise was sufficient to gain the application mark available.

Question 3

- (a) (i) and (ii) Both were well answered by most candidates. A small number of candidates did not read **part (ii)** carefully and provided an example of a secondary method.
- (b) This question was not well answered by many candidates. The strongest answers had identified a factor from section 8.2 of the specification and explained why this is a factor to be considered. The most common correct answers being cost, and type of information provided. Some candidates did not gain the explanation mark available as they described the factors rather than saying why they should be considered.
- (c) Candidates were confused by the non-price nature of this social enterprise and incorrectly stated that its success could be measured by the profit generated. A mark of 2 was common as candidates identified ways of judging success but struggled to develop their answers in the context of this producer co-operative. The strongest answers had recognised that key measures of success would be the enterprise reducing the cost of supplying vegetables or recruiting many other schools.

Question 4

- (a) This part of the specification was not well understood. Only the most able candidates could provide a clear description of a suitable document. A common error was to state that a business plan is required in a formal meeting. A small number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (b) Many candidates were unclear on this area of the specification. Such candidates often described potential actions involved in the negotiation stages rather than explaining the stage as required. Such candidates often described the research they had completed with no reference to planning. Such answers could gain no credit.
- (c) The strongest responses explained how the producer co-operative would reduce the cost of food and vegetables or improve the variety of foods available. These responses made good use of the case study material to show how this co-operative solved the identified problems for the school of high delivery charges and student complaints. The mark scheme provides an example of such a response. Weaker answers often focussed upon the benefit of closer relations with other schools. Such answers often did not explain why this was a benefit and therefore gained one mark.

- (d) The correct answer most given was that the principal may refuse permission. As this answer was in the context of the enterprise in the case study it scored two marks. Even the best answers struggled to gain the third mark by explaining why this risk would be an issue. The mark scheme provides examples of how this point could be developed fully to gain all the marks available.

The weakest answers identified risks which were unrelated to the case study and gained one mark.

Question 5

- (a) This term was not well understood by most candidates who provided very vague ideas such as '*does not change*'. Such answers were too vague for credit as the key aspect that costs do not change with output/sales/production was missing.
- (b) As with **part (a)** above, many candidates provided very vague definitions of this term.
- (c) Strong responses had identified crowdfunding and a bank loan as suitable methods. Such responses explained, using information from the case study, why these would be suitable methods for this enterprise. A small number of answers incorrectly stated fundraising rather than selecting methods from section 6.1 of the syllabus.
- (d) A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. Weaker responses had confused ethical with legal obligations and explained the need to follow health and safety laws, gaining zero marks. The strongest responses were able to explain how fair trade and donation of excess produce to others could be used by this enterprise. A mark of 1 or 2 was common on this part of the question.

Section B

As in previous years candidates' scored slightly higher in **Questions 6(a)** and **6(b)** which both relate to the case study. **Questions 7(a)** and **7(b)** require candidates to embed examples from their own enterprise experience throughout their answers. It should be noted that very little, if any, credit is given to candidates who write an introductory paragraph describing their enterprise experience. This year a number of candidates did not attempt questions in this section.

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question, although the majority were awarded marks within the bottom of level 2. The strongest answers had identified two suitable methods of communication, such as a presentation or a letter, and showed how these would be effective in this situation. Candidates who gained level 3 often explained how a written method would allow the teachers to share the information with their principal encouraging them to agree. The weakest answers had ignored the stem of the question and described the benefits of a meeting. Such answers could not be rewarded.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the benefits and costs of each option before coming to a decision. The strongest responses had gained marks within level 3 by using the information within the case study to justify their points. Such responses often made effective use of their answers to questions in **Section A** to support the points made. The weakest answers simply stated a list of benefits of being a sole trader and did not answer the question set.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss how they decided if risks were worth taking in their enterprise project. Many candidates struggled to gain marks above level 1 as they misread the question and simply provided a list of general risks for enterprises. The most successful candidates gained marks in level 3 by providing specific examples of risks they faced and how they weighed up the risk versus the potential benefit. Most frequently this was through completing further research or taking mitigating actions to reduce the risk.

- (b) Many candidates struggled to answer this question effectively. Although they attempted to evaluate their presentation candidates often provided very little clear application to their enterprise project. This style of answer limits the candidate's mark to the bottom of level 2. The strongest responses often started by identifying the purpose of their presentation. They then focussed upon how they practised the delivery of the presentation before a variety of audiences or described the research completed. The candidate then explained how these actions resulted in a successful presentation. Success often being measured by achieving the original aim or being judged as successful by a teacher. Very few candidates attempted the two-sided approach required for level 4 answers.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13 Case Study

Key messages

Centres should encourage candidates to focus directly and clearly upon the 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 zero as they did not answer the question set. This was an issue in **Questions 5(b) and 7(a)**. Additionally, failure to include the requested examples hindered achievement within **Questions 3(c) and 3(d)**.

Some areas of the syllabus were not well understood by candidates particularly enterprise skills covered in **Question 2(c)**, break-even calculation covered in **Question 3(a)** and financial documents **Question 3(d)**. Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering financial calculations and why documents are useful to an enterprise.

General comments

Candidates displayed strong knowledge of many areas of the syllabus. There was evidence that schools and candidates had focused upon the skills required to do well in this section of the paper. Many candidates produced strong answers within **Section B** especially **Question 6**. Candidates continue to struggle to gain the highest marks available in **Question 7**. This was generally due to a lack of application to their own enterprise project.

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

- 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)**
- 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 **Questions 7(a) and 7(b)**, 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) (i) Generally, well answered with many candidates accurately stating a precise definition. Weaker responses did not gain marks by stating that this was research gathered by yourself, which could also apply to secondary research. This answer was therefore too vague for credit.
- (ii) Most candidates gained one mark by understanding that this was information that already exists. Many candidates included examples in their answer which did not add to the definition.

- (b)(i) Well answered by most candidates who generally identified the interview with Leyland. A small number of candidates incorrectly stated that this was a focus group.
- (ii) Many candidates correctly identified one of the two methods used by the case study entrepreneur.
- (c) Candidates were aware of a variety of disadvantages of primary research and many gained full marks for this question.

Question 2

- (a) Generally, very well answered, the most common correct answer being the example given within the mark scheme.
- (b) The strongest answers had identified that a lack of specialist skills is a major problem for working alone. Identification that Kathy lacked the IT skills to set up the website showed the application required to gain the second mark.
- (c) Candidates were aware of a variety of different enterprise skills. The strongest answers had provided a detailed example to show the impact that using this skill had on their enterprise. There was some evidence that candidates had not carefully read the question. These candidates did not fully develop their explanation to show the affect the skill had upon their success or failure. A maximum of 4 marks was available for such answers.

Question 3

- (a) A significant number of candidates were unable to provide an accurate formula for this calculation. Many candidates confused this with profit or revenue.
- (b) Very well answered with almost 95 per cent of candidates providing the correct answer.
- (c) Although candidates often recognised that this would alter the costs for each kit, most candidates were unable to use information from the case study to fully develop their answer. The strongest responses had recognised that this would reduce the profit per item below the \$15 calculated in **part (c)** or increase the break-even quantity.
- (d) The strongest answers identified a financial document from those listed in section 6.4 of the syllabus. The answers explained, using a specific example from the case study, how this would assist Kathy. The mark scheme shows an example of such a successful answer. Some candidates had a lack of understanding of financial documents and their purpose. A significant minority of candidates stated incorrectly that cashflow statements show profit.

Question 4

- (a)(i) This part of the specification was not well understood. Only the strongest answers gave evidence of the purpose of marketing for customers. Many candidates confused this with the benefit to the enterprise and gained no marks.
- (ii) Generally well answered with a range of correct answers being presented.
- (b) Candidates provided a range of correct answers. Some candidates had not carefully read the question and stem and stated incorrectly leaflets or flyers. The weakest responses had identified emails as a marketing communication rather than the method of delivering the marketing communication.
- (c) The strongest answers identified the advantages and disadvantages as outlined in the mark scheme and apply these specifically to the case study. Most commonly the correct answers focussed upon the advantage of being posted directly to the target audience and the disadvantage of being seen as spam. Many candidates correctly identified issues with the leaflet as presented within the case study. The weakest answers had provided generic comments such as cheap and contain limited information. Such candidates struggled to develop their answers fully in the context of the case study.

Question 5

- (a) Factors that should be considered in the planning of a negotiation were well understood by most candidates. Many correctly provided practical examples such as choosing a quiet location for setting the tone. Some candidates misunderstood the question and provided examples of general planning. Such answers could not be credited.
- (b) As with **part (a)** of this question weaker answers did not focus upon the entire question. Such answers had ignored the instruction to discuss the measure of success and simply described their negotiation. Candidates who scored highly frequently explained that they achieved their objective. Providing an example of this objective gained the second mark.
- (c) The strongest responses had identified their objective, stated an action they took to reach this objective and the impact that this had. The most common correct actions focussed upon either making high profit or being ethical. In these cases, candidates explained how these objectives affected the raw materials purchased.

Section B

It was clear that many candidates had made good use of their preparation time to fully analyse the pre-issued case study. As in previous years candidates' scored more highly in **Questions 6(a)** and **6(b)** which both related to the case study. **Questions 7(a)** and **7(b)** require candidates to embed examples from their own enterprise experience throughout their answers. It should be noted that very little, if any, credit is given to candidates who write an introductory paragraph describing their enterprise experience.

Question 6

- (a) Some strong answers were presented for this question, although the majority were awarded marks within level 2. The strongest answers had recognised that as a sole trader with little finance Kathy would require finance to cover some of her costs, but that trade credit is often not supplied to these new enterprises. Weaker answers included that payments to creditors would come from profit rather than total revenue. A small number of candidates misread the question and analysed the effect on both Kathy and the supplier. In this situation the examiner marked the entire answer and credit was given for the strongest points.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the impact of two of the stated actions on Kathy's future success. A few candidates considered all three actions, which resulted in very descriptive answers which often gained a mark at the bottom of level 2. The best answers identified that in this competitive, but niche market sector Kathy would need to provide a good service but continue to develop. Candidates who gained a mark in level 4 were able to explain both the potential benefits and costs of each of the two options discussed. Candidates however, struggled to provide the clearly reasoned evaluation of both options which is a requirement for the highest marks.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss examples from their own enterprise project. Candidates were required to show understanding of the importance of any two of the headings generally included in an action plan. A noticeable number of candidates misread the question and discussed their general planning. Such candidates often discussed market research and financial plans and gained zero marks. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest responses explained how knowing the time frame for tasks and who was responsible helped their enterprise to meet deadlines or monitor completion. To gain marks in level 3 such candidates provided examples which were clearly related to their own enterprise experience.
- (b) There were some very strong answers to this question which provided detailed evaluations of the impact of some of the factors listed on their enterprise project. Many successful answers explained the impacts, both positive and negative, of covid rules and regulations. It was pleasing to see that candidates were willing to make realistic assessments of their enterprise rather than simply state they had been very successful. Application was present in almost all answers.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02 Coursework

Key messages

- It is essential candidates have access to the syllabus for the year of examination to ensure the evidence meets the relevant descriptors for each task.
- Candidates should be advised they do not need to include additional documents such as business plans and no marks are available for producing them.
- Marks for analysis and evaluation are awarded generously. Candidates must provide detailed explanations to develop and justify points made. All points made must clearly relate to their chosen project, and not outline general theory.
- Assessors should annotate the coursework based on the assessment criteria. This will help to show how and why a particular mark is being awarded.

General comments

Candidates selected a variety of appropriate and interesting projects. Making or selling food continues to be the most popular option. There is nothing wrong with this, as the project selected must be both feasible and viable for candidates to carry out. Other popular choices included selling clothing, making craft products and organising sporting or fashion events.

Most candidates are not able to develop points sufficiently to access the analysis and evaluation marks. A list of advantages and/or disadvantages is not analysis. All points should be developed in context to show the impact on their enterprise. Context means using examples from the project as supporting evidence. Instead of identifying a wide range of factors, candidates should be encouraged to focus on two or three key points for each option, which they can then analyse. Good analysis means each point being further developed to show the consequences of an action for their project. For example, because of this X happened, which (could) lead to Y, and therefore Z. Evaluation requires candidates to make justified decisions. This means providing a clear reason, ideally with evidence, to support any decision made. To access the higher mark bands, good analysis and evaluation must be shown throughout the task.

Candidates must provide all the required materials to access the full range of marks. **Section 4** of the syllabus provides clear guidance about what candidates must submit for each task. Many candidates continue to include business plans and skills audits as part of task one. These additional materials are unnecessary and waste candidates time which could be used more productively on other activities.

Several candidates exceeded the word limit. While they are not currently penalised for this, it is important candidates present their work in a clear and precise format.

It is a syllabus requirement that assessors annotate the work. All coursework must be annotated 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 in the work. This should be done on the work itself, at the point of award.

Comments on specific tasks

Task 1

All candidates presented the work in a report format. Most candidates identify advantages and disadvantages for at least two ideas and gathered market research. Better performing candidates presented data collected in an appropriate chart format and tried to draw relevant conclusions from the evidence they

had obtained. Only the strongest responses attempted to use the data to support decisions made. Weaker responses simply listed points or included charts without commenting on the results. To improve, candidates could quote the numbers/results from their market research to justify why one option was chosen or not.

Task 2

- (a) Most candidates did identify two or three significant issues based on their action plan. Some included up to 9 problems which was unnecessary as the key to accessing the higher levels is depth of analysis, not number of points. Better responses identified relevant issues in context and explained how they planned to manage each one. Only the best responses attempted to include a selection of solutions for each problem. Weaker responses tended to list general problems and solutions, without explaining why it is a problem for their enterprise or what would happen if it was not managed. Some described actions taken retrospectively. This is a planning activity so must be forward looking – focusing on what they could do, and not what they did.

Some presented the work in the form of a risk assessment. This should be discouraged as it includes complex information such as the severity and likelihood of risk, which is not required at this level. At the same time the format of a risk assessment does not encourage candidates to focus on the required elements in sufficient detail – what is the problem, why is it a problem, what would happen if not managed/overcome as well as detailed explanations of at least two possible solutions for each problem.

- (b) All candidates provided written evidence explaining possible sources of finance or methods of marketing communication. A small number of candidates provided evidence for both options which was unnecessary.

Only the strongest responses included detailed explanations to support why each option might be appropriate or not. Weaker responses stated general advantages and disadvantages of each option but did not apply the theory to their project. Points must be in context to access Level 3.

The second part is a presentation outlining their proposals for finance or marketing communications. The presentation and written element must cover the same option. Slides should be included but these are for reference purposes only. The witness statement is the assessed element. This should focus on the enterprise and communication skills shown by the individual candidate during the presentation, and not summarise the content. Many stated skills shown but did not provide details outlining what the candidate did to demonstrate these skills.

A small number of candidates did not include a signed witness statement. This restricted the mark band that these candidates could access.

Task 3

This task was generally well attempted. It was pleasing to see that most candidates did include negotiation as one of the five skills, and the best responses included detailed plans for negotiation.

The strongest responses included detailed examples to show how they had used each of the five named enterprise skills when implementing their project. Instead of naming individual skills, weaker responses simply described activities that they had carried out.

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.

Most of the marks awarded were generous. **Task 4** is challenging as only AO3 (analysis and evaluation) skills are assessed. Candidates should try to identify two or three key issues, including at least one positive and one negative outcome, for each area. Each outcome then needs to be developed, using phrases such as 'therefore', 'so' or 'this means'. These connective words can help candidates develop their observations to explain the consequences or significance of issues made for their project. Only the strongest responses attempted to analyse key issues. However, most responses simply described actions taken. Such work cannot gain more than Level 2 marks.

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0454 Enterprise June 2022
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Many candidates were able to make simple conclusions and recommendations for improvement. However, only a small number of candidates used evidence collected to support their conclusions. Some submitted a variety of documents including photographs and receipts, but it was not clear why these materials had been included. 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.