

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/11 Case Study

Key messages

Areas for development within candidates answers remain as application of knowledge to relevant examples and development of points to show the impact they have. Candidates would benefit from spending more time before the examination considering the pre-issued case study and the impacts of issues it raises.

General comments

Candidates struggled with some topics tested on this paper. A small number of candidates did not attempt some questions in each section. The topic areas which were an issue include topics 2.1, 6.4 and 8.1. Candidates would benefit from further study of the reasons why enterprise documents are produced.

Candidates continue to find it difficult to gain the highest marks available in **Section B**. This was generally due to a lack of explanation of the impact of the points raised. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt either part of **Question 7**.

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

- Learn why enterprise documents and procedures are important.
- 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.
- In longer answer questions such as those in **Section B** candidates should be encouraged to develop chains of reasoning showing knowledge, application and impact.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates had a good understanding of market research and communication. A small number of candidates used research as an answer in both parts.
- (b) Topic 8.1 as tested in this question was not clearly understood. Candidates were aware that marketing may increase sales but often explained this in **part (i)** rather than **part (ii)**. A number of candidates thought that **part (ii)** referred to the owners of a different enterprise. Such candidates found it difficult to explain a benefit of marketing.
- (c) There were some very good answers to this question. Such answers focused on the benefit of this free method and the lack of control that the enterprise would have. A noticeable number of candidates incorrectly thought that word of mouth marketing meant that the owner of the enterprise would individually tell people about their enterprise.
- (d) A small number of candidates did not gain a mark on this part of the question as they did not include an example from their own enterprise project to support their answer. A significant number

of candidates incorrectly stated that negotiation or communication are enterprise skills showing a lack of awareness of topic 3.1 of the specification.

Question 2

- (a) Enterprise capability (topic 1.1) was frequently confused with enterprise skills (topic 3.1).
- (b) The strongest responses identified examples from the case study and linked these to skills from topic 3.1. Weaker answers ignored the requirement to *'identify two examples from the case study'* and simply stated two enterprise skills. Such answers could not be credited.
- (c) Candidates found this to be the most difficult part of **Question 2**. Many candidates did not know the stages of the enterprise process. The weakest responses thought that the headings in the case study represented these stages. A mark of 1 or 2 was common as stronger answers stated stages, usually stages 1 and 3. Even the strongest answers lacked an explanation with an example about how either stage was used in the case study enterprise.

Question 3

- (a) Candidate clearly understood this topic area and there were some very good answers. Weaker answers described the term profit rather than explaining how it would be reduced due to the rising cost of taxation.
- (b) The topic of business objectives was well understood by most candidates. However, many candidates gained one mark on this question as they identified a business objective rather than explained how it applied to their enterprise project.
- (c) This question discriminated well between candidates of different abilities. The strongest responses identified a risk in their enterprise, identified the action they took and explained how this action reduced the risk. Candidates who took this approach most commonly explained the action of completing market research or purchasing safety equipment. Candidates who discussed SWOT or PEST analysis often found it difficult to explain how this action helped with the risk. A mark of 1 was common for such answers.
- (d) Candidates clearly enjoyed discussing technology. The most successful answers explained how access to the internet and mobile devices allowed potential customers to view marketing communications or purchase items. Weaker responses often stated that technology helped them to complete research with no further explanation. Had such candidates explained that the internet or social media were used to share surveys a mark could have been awarded. However, such answers were frequently too vague to be credited.

Question 4

- (a) Virtually all candidates were able to correctly calculate this number. A small number of candidates added the variable cost to the selling price.
- (b) Fewer candidates were aware of this calculation than that for **Question (a)**. Although the majority of those that attempted the question gained all of the marks available. A small but noticeable number did not attempt the question.
- (c) Many correct answers were provided for this question, the most common answers being receipts and a cashflow forecast. A number of candidates thought incorrectly that business and action plans were financial records. A noticeable number of candidates did not answer this part of the question.
- (d) Candidates who answered **Question 4(c)** correctly did well on this question. Such candidates were clearly aware of the purpose of each of the documents. Many candidates made effective use of **Question 3(a)** to explain how a financial document would assist in predicting the correct amount of tax to be paid. Weaker responses had vague statements such as the enterprise may go broke or you wont pay your bills. Such answers were considered too vague to be given credit.

Question 5

- (a) This term was not well understood by the majority of candidates. The strongest responses gained two marks by providing the answers listed in the mark scheme. Weaker responses simply reorganised the words saying that this was a network of businesses and gained zero marks.
- (b) Candidates found this to be one of the most difficult questions in **Section A**. Many candidates confused the meeting minutes with an agenda.
- (c) (i)(ii) Although candidates were aware of the concept of a sole trader many struggled to apply this knowledge to the enterprise in the case study. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt either part of this question. The strongest answers recognised that a benefit would be the ability to make decisions quickly. These answers often used examples of decisions that Fern would need to make to support their answer. Candidates who focused on the benefit of profit not needing to be shared often found it challenging to develop their answer to gain all 3 marks. In the disadvantage section the most successful answers focused on the problems of raising finance for this enterprise which wanted to expand.

Section B

Unlike previous years a noticeable number of candidates did not attempt **Question 6(a)** and **7(b)**. To gain marks in the highest levels in this section candidates need to explain the impact on the relevant enterprise of each point they explain. Candidates frequently provide answers which contain lots of knowledge but they do not explain the effect of this knowledge. The mark scheme contains examples of how candidates could show impact in their answers to each questions.

Question 6

- (a) Candidates found it difficult to effectively answer this question. Level 3 marks were rarely awarded. The strongest answers gained a mark in the bottom of Level 2 by recognising that trade credit would allow Fern to gain the supplies she needed. To gain a mark in Level 3 candidates needed to explain the effect of this on the enterprise. For example, candidates could have explained that this would allow Fern the extra cash needed to afford the rent of the stall. A number of candidates ignored the requirement to analyse the effect on Fern or the farmer and discussed both. By focussing on too many areas such answers often lacked the depth of analysis required to gain the higher marks.
- (b) Candidates found this to be the most approachable of the **section B** questions. The question required candidates to justify the most appropriate option for the development of this enterprise. The strongest answers gained marks in Level 3 by using evidence from the case study material to justify their choice. Most frequently the strongest answers used the calculation from **Question 4(b)** and the survey results to justify that the railway stall would be affordable for the entrepreneur. To gain a mark in Level 4 candidates needed to explain why one of the options was not a good choice. Although many candidates attempted this, they often stated a negative aspect of the option rather than explain using evidence from the case study why this was unsuitable.

Question 7

- (a) A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. To do well candidates needed to explain how the document helped their enterprise project to work more effectively. The strongest answers gained a mark in Level 2 by explaining the purpose of the document with an example from their enterprise. For the action plan this was often an explanation of how tasks were divided. To move the answer into Level 3 candidates needed to explain why this was beneficial for their enterprise. This could have been achieved by explaining how dividing the tasks allowed the candidates to complete the work required within the time frame. The weakest answers described the contents of the documents with no application to the candidate's enterprise.
- (b) Candidates found this to be the most difficult question on the examination paper. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt the question. To gain a mark in Level 3 candidates needed to state a method of research and explain how this was effective in helping their enterprise to gather information. Such an answer would move into Level 4 by explaining why a method of research was not effective for their enterprise. Many candidates seemed to be confused by the bullet points in the question which were intended as a guide to assist their writing. Weaker answers contained a

sentence describing each of the bullet points listed with no application to the candidate's enterprise research.

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 some questions before starting their answers. This was seen in the answers to **Questions 2(b)** and **7(b)**.

Candidates had a lack of understanding of some topic areas. These included topics:

- 4.1 changes in government policy.
- 6.4 financial records particularly break even calculations.
- 8.4 marketing communications especially sponsorship.
- 10.2 meetings and presentations particularly how to analyse and evaluate the success of a meeting.

General comments

Many candidates continue to find it difficult to gain higher marks in each question as they did not apply their answers to the required enterprise.

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 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.
- Always try to include the impact of any action or change on the enterprise.
- 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 every paragraph of their essay.
- Answers to calculations from **Section A** questions will often be useful evidence to support a discussion in **Questions 6(a)** and **6(b)**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to state two risks, usually financial or economic.
- (b) Research and risk analysis were often well explained although many answers lacked reference to the candidate's enterprise project. A mark of one was therefore common.
- (c) A wide range of entrepreneurs were identified as part of this answer. Stronger answers identified a skill from topic 3.1 of the specification and provided an example of how the entrepreneur had used this skill. Candidates who chose the skills of creativity and innovation often struggled to provide two detailed explanations as the skills overlap. An error made by some candidates was to identify general rather than enterprise skills. The most common incorrect answers being, decision making, negotiation and communication.

Question 2

- (a) The vast majority of candidates answered this question correctly.
- (b) Candidates found this question quite challenging. The strongest answers identified a problem the candidate faced and then explained how the described solution helped to reduce that problem. Weaker answers attempted to explain how the candidates were creative ignoring the link to solving a problem.
- (c) This term was not well understood. The vast majority of candidates gained one mark for an imprecise definition appreciating that this limits the amount of money available within the enterprise.
- (d) Although candidates were aware of the concept of a not-for-profit enterprise many were not able to explain a disadvantage of this type of business organisation. The strongest answers explained how lack of finance or reliance on volunteers would impact the enterprise. A small number of candidates incorrectly thought that not-for-profit would mean the enterprise managers would not know how to run an enterprise.

Question 3

- (a) This question was generally answered.
- (b) Virtually all candidates were able to state a method. Many however found it difficult to explain why their chosen method would be suitable for this enterprise. Answers claiming that the method was cheap or fast did not explain why this would be helpful for the visitor centre and therefore could not be credited. A mark of one was therefore common. Answers focussing on interviews were most successful. Such answers often explained how the potential for in-depth responses would assist the visitor centre.
- (c) The strongest answers explained the need for governments to assess enterprise profits in order to calculate the correct tax to be paid. Weaker answers often made vague statements such as 'to see how well they are doing'. Such answers were too vague to be credited.
- (d) The question required candidates to identify a change in government policy. The strongest answers focused upon how changes to grant availability or taxes would affect the potential survival of the visitor centre. Some candidates repeated their answer to **Question 5(c)** and gained some credit for awareness of the potential impact. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.

Question 4

- (a) Precise definitions of this term were rarely provided. Most candidates were able to gain one mark by showing some understanding.
- (b) The majority of candidates gained full marks.
- (c) This calculation was less well understood than fixed costs. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (d) The strongest answers recognised that over the longer term purchasing the machine would be a cheaper option. Such answers were usually supported by calculations of the total cost for each option over five years. Weaker answers attempted a decision but could not provide evidence to support this decision.

Question 5

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to provide two correct examples. Some candidates stated 'documents' and 'records'. As some documents and records are informal these answers were too vague to be credited.
- (b) Candidates who recognised that formal language shows respect or politeness were most successful in this question. Such answers often gained the second mark for explaining why this is

important. Weaker answers often simply described the difference between formal and informal language with examples. Such answers did not address the question asked and gained no credit.

- (c) The strongest answers recognised that the visitor centres plan for new activities would be impacted by such regulations. Many strong answers quoted that the centre was not able to afford safe children's play equipment. A small, but noticeable, number of candidates did not answer this part of the question.
- (d) This topic was not well understood by many candidates. The question appeared to be one of the most challenging in **Section A**. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt the question. Full marks were very rarely awarded. The strongest answers showed understanding that the benefit to society meant more than the benefit to the individual and were able to identify an action taken by the visitor centre which would have this impact.

Section B

Candidates continue to find it challenging to gain marks in the higher levels in this section of the examination paper. Candidates should be encouraged to always explain the impact of any point that they make on the enterprise. Examples should be used in every paragraph of the answer to support the points made.

Question 6

- (a) As in previous sessions candidates showed they had good knowledge of the contents of the documents. However, they found it difficult to explain how the documents could help an enterprise. The strongest answers gained a mark at the bottom of Level 2 by explaining that the action plan would help divide up the tasks to be completed in the new project and the business plan could assist in the choice between projects. Application to the visitor centre project was therefore very limited. To move answers into Level 3 candidates needed to explain the positive impact on the enterprise of producing and using these documents.
- (b) As with **part (a)** of this question candidates clearly had knowledge of the topic area, marketing communication methods. Many answers contained detailed lists of the benefits and disadvantages of each method. Very few candidates were able to apply their answer to the enterprise in the case study. A mark at the top of Level 1 was therefore common. Candidates who gained a mark in Level 2 or 3 recognised that the lack of revenue and the local nature of the customer base would make posters or social media the most appropriate methods. The two-sided evaluative approach required to gain a mark in Level 4 was not attempted by most candidates. Sponsorship as a method of marketing communication was generally not understood. Frequently candidates explained incorrectly that the visitor centre would be sponsored by an organisation not the other way around.

Question 7

- (a) The majority of candidates gained a mark at the top of Level 1 or the bottom of Level 2. Level 2 was often achieved by candidates providing practical examples of how the bullet-points were used in their enterprise. For example, technology being used to deliver surveys directly to the target market or dealing with an issue in the enterprise by using problem solving skills. Answers which then explained the impact of this on the enterprise gained marks in Level 3. Weaker answers described the meaning of each of the bullet points or identified enterprise skills with no attempt made to apply this knowledge to the candidate's enterprise. A small but noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (b) Answers to this question were frequently very disorganised and difficult to follow. There was some evidence that candidates did not read this question carefully before starting their answer. Such candidates evaluated the success of their entire enterprise project rather than a meeting. Such answers gained no credit. The strongest answers identified an action that was taken most frequently this was producing relevant documents such as an agenda. The answer then explained how these documents ensured the meeting was able to be organised or meet its objective. The weakest answers simply stated that their meeting was successful as they received the money they wanted with no attempt to explain what actions were taken to achieve this. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13 Case Study

Key messages

Candidates who were familiar with the information and terms in the case study material scored well.

Centres should encourage candidates to make effective use of their time in revision to actively read and analyse the case study material before the examination.

Candidates showed understanding of many of the topics examined. However, they would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering why documents are useful to an enterprise and the impact of enterprise decisions on the operation and success of the enterprise.

General comments

There was some evidence that candidates did not carefully read the whole question before starting their answer. This was evident in **Questions 2(b), 2(d), 3(c) and 3(d)**.

Candidates were not confident in their knowledge of some of the terminology and topic areas in this examination paper. Key terms were often not well defined and a noticeable number of candidates did not attempt some of the questions. Many candidates had a very weak understanding of the content and purpose of a cashflow statement or forecast.

Candidates would benefit from further study of topics 4.3, 5.1, 7.2 and 10.2.

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

- Learn precise definitions of key terms.
- Consider the purpose behind producing enterprise documentation.
- 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.
- In **Section B** question **parts B** candidates should consider both the positives and negatives of any situation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Candidates found it difficult to provide a precise definition of this term and a mark of 1 was common. The weakest answers confused delegation with division of labour or delegates. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this definition.
- (b) Many candidates found this to be one of the most difficult questions in **Section A**. The strongest responses identified one of the enterprise skills, as outlined in the syllabus, and gave an example of how they had used this skill. The most frequent correct answers being taking the initiative or responsibility. Weaker responses assumed that being enterprising only involves making money. Such candidates often gained zero marks as they did not explain a way of being enterprising but ways that they boosted their income.

- (c) This question was generally well answered by the majority of candidates. Strong answers identified a point, such as those listed in the mark scheme, and explained using an example from the case study why this was an advantage or disadvantage. The most common correct advantage given was the ability to share workload amongst the teams. Such answers often quoted information from Table 1. The most common correct disadvantage was the need to rely upon each other supported by examples of the problems Team C faced in completing their task. Weaker candidates gained 2 marks by showing knowledge of an advantage or disadvantage without development.

Question 2

- (a) (i)(ii) This question differentiated well between candidates. Fewer candidates were aware of the term minutes than the document informing delegates of the time and place for a meeting. A noticeable number of candidates did not answer one or both sections of this question.
- (b) Stronger answers identified a way but only the very strongest linked this answer to a meeting in the candidate's own enterprise project. A mark of 1 was therefore common. The weakest answers described the success of the project rather than a meeting.
- (c) Many candidates were able to identify a benefit of this action. The most frequently given correct answers being to ensure tasks are divided equally or to help with monitoring. Candidates found it difficult to fully develop these answers into an explanation or provide a suitable example. The weakest answers copied material from the case study but could not apply this to the question set.
- (d) A wide range of correct answers were provided for this question. However, full marks were rare as candidates ignored the guidance in the question to relate their answer to their own action plan. An error made by a several candidates was to describe the monitoring or progress of their enterprise project not the action plan.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates did not seem to know this term. Some candidates attempted to reorganise the term to gain marks declaring that this was funding from a crowd. Such answers were considered too vague to be credited.
- (b) Well answered by the majority of candidates. A noticeable number of candidates provided the correct answer but then continued their calculation to determine the total amount repaid. Such candidates were given the benefit of the doubt.
- (c) An error made by many candidates was to state that a cashflow forecast calculates the profit for an enterprise. Stronger responses provided most of the answers stated in the mark scheme.
- (d) Candidates clearly have knowledge of the contents of this document. However, such knowledge gained little credit in this question. Stronger responses demonstrated that a bank may request this document before agreeing to provide finance. Only the best answers explained how the business plan could help the bank with this decision. Candidates frequently gained the application mark by quoting the amount of finance required from Table 2.

Question 4

- (a) This topic was generally well understood. Many candidates were able to state two relevant areas or give practical examples. The focus was often on regulation linked to areas in their own enterprise such as food or advertisement. Some candidates were able to recognise that data protection law was an issue within the case study enterprise.
- (b) The most successful answers were based around the material in the case study. Such answers recognised that email requires access to the recipients email address. Many candidates gained 2 of the 3 marks available by explaining the problems of emails being lost or treated as junk mail.
- (c) A wide range of correct factors were stated. Weaker answers contained vague statements such as the efficiency of the market or the size of the population. Such answers were too vague to be credited.

- (d) Candidates were clearly expecting a question on this topic area and many chose suitable methods. The strongest answers were able to explain why the chosen method would be suitable for a school based enterprise with little finance. Weaker answers simply described the method of marketing chosen. A small but noticeable number of candidates confused marketing communications with market research.

Question 5

- (a) The most common correct answer provided was parents who could give financial support. Such an answer gained 2 of the 3 marks available. To gain the third mark candidates needed to apply their answer to the situation in the case study. Those that recognised parents could be targeted for crowdfunding often gained this mark.
- (b) For many candidates this was the most challenging question in **Section A**. A significant proportion of candidates did not attempt this question. Candidates who attempted the question often identified only one of the stages, usually planning or measuring success. Candidates were not able to apply the stage identified to the case study enterprise.
- (c) The most successful answers to this question frequently focused on the financial risk of spending £875. A mark of 2 was common however as candidates could not fully develop their answers. The mark scheme shows examples of ways that the 3 marks could have been gained.

Section B

Candidates continue to find it challenging to gain the highest marks available in **Section B**. This was generally due to candidates considering only the positives of their own enterprise project or not fully developing points to show the impact on the enterprise under discussion. Within each essay candidates should be encouraged to identify a point of knowledge, provide an example from the enterprise and then explain the effect on the enterprise.

Question 6

- (a) Some strong answers were presented for this question. To gain a mark within Level 3 candidates needed to show awareness of the impact on the enterprise if the needs of each stakeholder were, or were not, met. The strongest answers recognised that the study room would not be opened if teachers did not support it and could be closed if candidates did not use it. The majority of candidates were awarded marks at the bottom of Level 2 by recognising that candidates would not use the room if it did not meet their needs.
- (b) A number of candidates were confused by elements in this question. Some confused crowdfunding with fundraising. Others produced essays discussing what parents or candidates would want from a study room with no reference to finance. The strongest answers were able to gain a mark towards the bottom of Level 3 by analysing the full cost of a bank loan supported by a relevant calculation. Candidates who gained marks in Level 2 often made good use of the case study material to identify why crowdfunding could not be used. Such answers could have developed into Level 3 had the candidate explained the impact on the success of crowdfunding of not having access to the parent's addresses.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates clearly understood methods of communication and many gained a mark at the bottom of Level 2 by describing the methods used or their advantages. To move answers into Level 3 candidates needed to explain why the method was, or was not, successful in their enterprise. A small number of candidates gained this level by explaining a problem that occurred due to the method of communication used. The mark scheme shows an example of this style of answer.
- (b) The strongest answers to this question gained a mark in Level 3 by explaining how their aim of being profitable led to a need to reduce costs which reduced the quality of their product. To move into Level 4 candidates needed to evaluate two aims considering both a positive and negative impact on the operation of their enterprise. Very few candidates attempted this style of answer. A large number of candidates confused being ethical with being environmentally conscious. Such answers were given the benefit of the doubt this session.

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.
- 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.
- Candidates continue to select appropriate and interesting projects, which is pleasing to see.

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. Candidates should be strongly discouraged from producing additional materials including business plans as there are no marks available for them.
- Centres are advised to ensure candidates have access to the relevant syllabus for the year in which they take their examinations. A small number of candidates appear to be using out of date syllabus resources so included unnecessary elements including posters and/or a skill audit.
- 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 limited. Candidates should 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. 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 best 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, better 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 best responses offered two detailed solutions for each problem and linked them to their project, which is essential to access Level 3.

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.

A small number of 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.

- (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 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 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, candidates cannot access 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, where about 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 (or responsible adult), 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 was 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 marks. Some witness 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. It was pleasing to see that most candidates referred to negotiation as one of the five skills, and the best 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’ 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.

Not all the skills discussed were valid. For example planning, customer service, financial management and marketing are not classed as enterprise skills in this syllabus. **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.

The marking of this task was 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. Most reviewed everything that 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 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.

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 should not be included.