

ENTERPRISE

<p>Paper 0454/11 Case Study</p>

Key messages

There was evidence of the improved use of the case study within answers. Many centres and candidates had clearly prepared well for the examination by working carefully through the case study but the main issue, especially in section B questions, is that candidates answer generically. Candidates appeared to struggle to use examples from their own enterprise project within answers. This is a particular problem within **Question 7**, which required application to the candidate's own project. Candidates who do not do this will not be able to access marks in levels 2, 3 and 4.

Candidates should be advised to read the stem of each question carefully. Answers must relate to the information as directed in the stem and question.

Centres should encourage candidates to include practical examples to support their answers in questions where they are directed to use their own enterprise experience.

General comments

There was evidence that some aspects of the course require more thorough analysis, particularly Topics 4.3, 5 and 7.

Centres would be advised to spend time ensuring that candidates understand fully the reason for completing enterprise documents such as action plans, business plans and financial documents.

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

- Prior to the examination, attempts should be made to apply the issues raised in the case study to the candidates' own enterprise experience.
- Pay careful attention to the wording of questions, particularly the focus required for any application.
- Consider the marks awarded for each question; four and six mark questions require candidates to provide developed answers, not long lists of knowledge.
- Answers to **Question 6** needed to relate to the enterprise in the case study whilst in **Question 7** the answer needed to relate to the candidate's own enterprise project.
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7(a)** and **7(b)**, candidates should ensure that the examiner understands what good or service the enterprise provided.
- Plan answers to Section B questions, to ensure that the answer includes application, analysis and evaluation points.
- Candidates would benefit from guidance and further practice in structuring answers to illustrate evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) (i) Generally very well answered, with many candidates accurately explaining the term.

- (ii) This term was less familiar to candidates. The strongest responses identified that this was a worldwide organisation that ensures producers receive a fair price for their products. Weaker responses rearranged the words in the question to say it meant trade was fair or discussed international trade. Centres would benefit from revisiting this area of the syllabus.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to correctly identify two types.
- (c) This part of the question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. Candidates who clearly focussed their answer on their own enterprise project scored highly. For example, by stating that due to import restrictions in their country they had a problem obtaining food supplies and they solved this by paying a higher price for local supplies, a sound contextualised answer gaining all of the marks available. Often, candidates identified general enterprise problems or solutions, without application to their own enterprise project, for example, 'we had little finance' or 'we completed research'. Such answers gained limited credit for knowledge.

Question 2

- (a) This question focussed upon Topic 7.1 of the syllabus. Only a few candidates were able to correctly explain the meaning of the term. A common error was to describe 'satisfying'. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (b) Candidates were generally able to explain the difference between these two terms and full marks were frequently awarded.
- (c) This part of the question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. The question required candidates to identify a need or want from the case study and then explain how the entrepreneur had ensured he met that need or want. The most successful responses made good use of the case study material and identified points such as those listed in the mark scheme. Weaker responses defined the terms needs and wants with no attempts made to apply that knowledge. Such answers could not be rewarded as the question required contextual answers. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 3

- (a) A range of correct responses were provided for this question.
- (b) Candidates were now always clear on the disadvantages of completing research. The most frequent correct answers given were the time and expense of completing market research. Only the strongest responses were able to explain why the stated point would be a disadvantage for an enterprise. A small number of candidates misread the question and explained advantages rather than disadvantages.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates demonstrated knowledge that enterprises need customers to earn revenue. The better responses made effective use of the case study material provided to explain the reason why attracting new customers was of importance to this social enterprise. Such responses were able to make the point that the aim of the enterprise was to help as many people as possible and that profits would be reinvested to help others.

Question 4

- (a) This question was well answered with a large number of candidates clearly defining the difference between the terms.
- (b) Candidates who gained the maximum marks appeared to have completed some research when covering topic 6.1(c) in the syllabus. A small number of candidates discussed ways to reduce costs in an enterprise.
- (c) There were a number of strong responses to this question. The strongest candidates used the case study to identify two different groups of people the entrepreneur, Tixy, would communicate with and then explained with examples how the language would be different. The most frequently stated difference being the formal language needed when talking to members of Social Enterprise S and the informal persuasive language needed when trying to attract volunteers.

Question 5

- (a) Generally a well-answered question. A number of weaker responses did not address the instruction in the question to state sources other than a social enterprise.
- (b) Candidates appeared to be comfortable in answering this question and many gained both of the marks available. A common error was to give examples of general information that would be included in a business plan rather than the financial information requested.
- (c) (i) A number of candidates were able to gain at least some credit for identifying a reason for completing financial documents. Very few candidates could develop their explanation in order to gain full marks.
- (ii) A large number of candidates were unable to identify the reasons a business plan would require updating. The weakest answers simply stated the reasons for drawing up a business plan, such as to gain finance, which could not be credited.

Section B

The most successful candidates in this section were clearly familiar with the case study material and their own enterprise experience, and provided detailed relevant examples within their answers.

Question 6

- (a) It was clear that a number of candidates had clear knowledge and understanding of the 'Lighting Project' case study. Such candidates were able to apply their answers to the particular risks faced by the enterprise described. Such answers often focused upon the risk of training the volunteers or the requirement for Tixy to pay his student loans. Very few candidates provided generalised answers that were not related to the case study.
- (b) This question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. Candidates had strong knowledge of sources of finance and many provided detailed lists of the advantages and disadvantages of each option, but this material needed to be related to the case study enterprise, and where it wasn't, this restricted the marks available. The best answers identified elements from the case study, such as those listed in the mark scheme, and used these points to make a justified decision on the suitability of each source for this enterprise.

Question 7

- (a) Generally candidates demonstrated knowledge of the processes involved in completing a cash flow statement and listed some of the items included in their own statement or forecast. The strongest responses were able to explain and analyse how their cash flow assisted the operation or success of their enterprise. Centres would benefit from revisiting this aspect of the syllabus, particularly the reasons why documents are helpful to an enterprise.
- (b) Candidates were clearly very aware of the parts of the negotiation process and often provided very detailed theoretical knowledge showing what each stage entailed, but this knowledge gained limited credit without context. The most able candidates were able to analyse and evaluate these points in relation to their own enterprise project, providing a justified argument for the most important part for their own enterprise. The most successful responses often focused upon preparation and negotiating their position when requesting supplies or sources of finance. A significant number of candidates did not make clear what good or service they produced or what the negotiation was for, which also limited credit.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/12
Case Study

Key messages

Many centres and candidates had clearly prepared well for the examination by working carefully through the case study, but the main issue, especially in section B questions, is that candidates answered generically. Candidates who do this will not be able to access marks in levels 2 to 4.

Candidates should be advised to read the stem of each question carefully. Answers must relate to the information or enterprise as directed in the stem and question.

Centres should encourage candidates to include practical examples to support their answers in questions where they are directed to use their own enterprise experience.

General comments

There were a number of very strong scripts demonstrating clear abilities to analyse and evaluate information towards a justified decision. There were some instances of candidates not completing the paper and a number of candidates did not attempt certain questions, mainly **Questions 3(c), 4(b) and 7(b)**.

Candidates displayed strong knowledge of the syllabus content. This was particularly evident in questions such as **1(a), 3(b) and 5(a)**. Application of knowledge to enterprise problems is an area where approaches to answers could be improved. This could be seen in **Questions 2(b)(ii), 3(c) and 5(d)**.

There was evidence that some aspects of the syllabuses would benefit from more thorough analysis, particularly the reasons why business documents need to be produced, as covered in **Questions 4 and 5**.

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

- Read the whole question carefully, including the stem.
- Within section B questions, candidates need to apply their answers to the enterprise stated in the question. Long lists of knowledge will not gain high marks.
- Answers to **Questions 6(a) and 6(b)** needed to relate to the enterprise in the case study.
- Answers to **Questions 7(a) and 7(b)** needed to relate to the candidate's own enterprise project
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7(a) and 7(b)**, candidates should ensure that it is clear to the Examiner what good or service the enterprise provided.
- Plan answers to Section B questions to ensure that the answer includes application, analysis and evaluation points.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Generally very well answered with many candidates accurately identifying two methods of research. Weaker responses used general phrases such as market research.

- (b) The strongest answers clearly identified two different parts of the action plan. A variety of correct points were given as listed in the mark scheme. A number of candidates confused action plans with business plans.
- (c) A number of candidates appeared to find this question quite challenging and repeated their answer to part (b). The strongest candidates identified a clear point and then developed this point to show how it would assist an enterprise.
- (d) Candidates appeared to find this question very challenging. The best responses recognised that action plans would need to be altered in the light of changes to the enterprise or its inability to complete a given task. Centres would benefit from revisiting this aspect of the syllabus.

Question 2

- (a) The strongest responses identified a challenge, such as competition, and then explained why this would have an effect upon an enterprise. Many candidates could identify relevant challenges but were unable to explain why these were challenges for an enterprise.
- (b)(i) This question was well answered. Candidates were able to use the case study material to explain how the entrepreneur had managed his time effectively to complete all of the work required.
- (ii) This part of the question was more challenging for candidates than part (i). The strongest responses identified a problem from the case study, such as finding a way to reach customers, and showed how Johnny had solved this problem. The weakest responses showed knowledge of the term but did not make effective use of the case study to provide examples.

Question 3

- (a) The term was well defined by a minority of candidates. Some candidates confused business network with a website. Many answers were vague.
- (b) This area of the syllabus was well understood by candidates. There were many full mark answers to this question.
- (c) Candidates who clearly focussed their answer on their own enterprise project scored highly in this question. For example, by stating that they had made a decision to sell cupcakes rather than smoothies and this meant they stood out from the competition and attracted more customers and sold out quickly. This would have been a sound contextualised answer gaining all of the marks available. Often candidates identified general decisions without application to their own enterprise project such as 'we decided on the best location'. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 4

- (a)(i)(ii) The majority of candidates scored at least one mark for each of the terms. To gain full marks candidates needed to show understanding that costs are fixed or variable in relation to output, which did not seem to be fully understood. Some candidates confused the two terms.
- (b) This part of the question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. The strongest responses linked higher expenses and revenue with larger enterprises and gave a relevant example. Weaker responses simply stated they were bigger without the required example. A number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (c) The most frequent correct answer was that budgets helped to avoid debt, limited unnecessary spending or identified problems through the use of variance analysis. Candidates who could explain how the budget assisted enterprises to avoid debt scored highly. This question required the identification of a problem – 'getting a loan' was not sufficient to be considered a creditable response.

Question 5

- (a) This topic was generally well understood. A common error was to confuse an agenda with a notice of a meeting.
- (b) The strongest answers explained that attendees would be prepared for the meeting in advance and know what documentation they should bring. Many candidates did not address the question wording 'explain why'.
- (c) Most candidates knew what existing customers were but did not comment on the 'retaining' part of the term, which limited credit.
- (d) Many candidates gained the two knowledge marks by identifying two methods of communication. A large number of answers lacked application to the case study, which limited credit.

Section B

A number of candidates did not apply their answer to the enterprise identified and therefore could not be awarded marks above Level 1. The most successful candidates in this section were clearly familiar with the case study material for 'Johnny's Pots' and their own enterprise experience.

Question 6

- (a) There were a range of answers to this question. Many answers identified the advantages or disadvantages of each option from the case study material. The best answers evaluated each option by showing how they would impact both positively and negatively upon Johnny's Pots.
- (b) Candidates had strong knowledge of sources of finance and many provided detailed lists of the advantages and disadvantages of each option, but this material needed to be related to the case study enterprise, and where it wasn't, this restricted the marks available. The best answers identified elements from the case study, such as those listed in the mark scheme, and used these points to make a justified decision on the best methods to choose in this situation.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss their own enterprise project. A sizeable number of candidates did not specifically state the risks that they faced, instead they provided a detailed theoretical account of risks. To gain the highest marks, candidates were required to analyse and evaluate how they dealt with the risks they faced, very few candidates were able to attempt such an evaluation. A significant number of candidates confused problems faced in an enterprise with risks that might occur.
- (b) Many candidates attempted to apply their answers to the context of their own enterprise project. Most frequently this was through explanations of how they communicated differently with students and teachers. Sound knowledge was often shown of methods of communication but appropriate language was less well understood. Reference to 'using appropriate language' was frequently missing from candidate answers. The lack of analysis in answers limited candidates' marks.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13
Case Study

Key messages

There was evidence of the improved use of the case study within answers. Many centres and candidates had clearly prepared well for the examination by working carefully through the case study but the main issue, especially in section B questions, is that candidates answer generically. Candidates appeared to struggle to use examples from their own enterprise project within answers. This is a particular problem within **Question 7**, which required application to the candidate's own project. Candidates who do not do this will not be able to access marks in levels 2, 3 and 4.

Candidates should be advised to read the stem of each question carefully. Answers must relate to the information as directed in the stem and question.

Centres should encourage candidates to include practical examples to support their answers in questions where they are directed to use their own enterprise experience.

General comments

There was evidence that some aspects of the course require more thorough analysis, particularly Topics 4.3, 5 and 7.

Centres would be advised to spend time ensuring that candidates understand fully the reason for completing enterprise documents such as action plans, business plans and financial documents.

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

- Prior to the examination, attempts should be made to apply the issues raised in the case study to the candidates' own enterprise experience.
- Pay careful attention to the wording of questions, particularly the focus required for any application.
- Consider the marks awarded for each question; four and six mark questions require candidates to provide developed answers, not long lists of knowledge.
- Answers to **Question 6** needed to relate to the enterprise in the case study whilst in **Question 7** the answer needed to relate to the candidate's own enterprise project.
- When discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 7(a)** and **7(b)**, candidates should ensure that the examiner understands what good or service the enterprise provided.
- Plan answers to Section B questions, to ensure that the answer includes application, analysis and evaluation points.
- Candidates would benefit from guidance and further practice in structuring answers to illustrate evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) (i)** Generally very well answered, with many candidates accurately explaining the term.

- (ii) This term was less familiar to candidates. The strongest responses identified that this was a worldwide organisation that ensures producers receive a fair price for their products. Weaker responses rearranged the words in the question to say it meant trade was fair or discussed international trade. Centres would benefit from revisiting this area of the syllabus.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to correctly identify two types.
- (c) This part of the question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. Candidates who clearly focussed their answer on their own enterprise project scored highly. For example, by stating that due to import restrictions in their country they had a problem obtaining food supplies and they solved this by paying a higher price for local supplies, a sound contextualised answer gaining all of the marks available. Often, candidates identified general enterprise problems or solutions, without application to their own enterprise project, for example, 'we had little finance' or 'we completed research'. Such answers gained limited credit for knowledge.

Question 2

- (a) This question focussed upon Topic 7.1 of the syllabus. Only a few candidates were able to correctly explain the meaning of the term. A common error was to describe 'satisfying'. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question.
- (b) Candidates were generally able to explain the difference between these two terms and full marks were frequently awarded.
- (c) This part of the question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. The question required candidates to identify a need or want from the case study and then explain how the entrepreneur had ensured he met that need or want. The most successful responses made good use of the case study material and identified points such as those listed in the mark scheme. Weaker responses defined the terms needs and wants with no attempts made to apply that knowledge. Such answers could not be rewarded as the question required contextual answers. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 3

- (a) A range of correct responses were provided for this question.
- (b) Candidates were now always clear on the disadvantages of completing research. The most frequent correct answers given were the time and expense of completing market research. Only the strongest responses were able to explain why the stated point would be a disadvantage for an enterprise. A small number of candidates misread the question and explained advantages rather than disadvantages.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates demonstrated knowledge that enterprises need customers to earn revenue. The better responses made effective use of the case study material provided to explain the reason why attracting new customers was of importance to this social enterprise. Such responses were able to make the point that the aim of the enterprise was to help as many people as possible and that profits would be reinvested to help others.

Question 4

- (a) This question was well answered with a large number of candidates clearly defining the difference between the terms.
- (b) Candidates who gained the maximum marks appeared to have completed some research when covering topic 6.1(c) in the syllabus. A small number of candidates discussed ways to reduce costs in an enterprise.
- (c) There were a number of strong responses to this question. The strongest candidates used the case study to identify two different groups of people the entrepreneur, Tixy, would communicate with and then explained with examples how the language would be different. The most frequently stated difference being the formal language needed when talking to members of Social Enterprise S and the informal persuasive language needed when trying to attract volunteers.

Question 5

- (a) Generally a well-answered question. A number of weaker responses did not address the instruction in the question to state sources other than a social enterprise.
- (b) Candidates appeared to be comfortable in answering this question and many gained both of the marks available. A common error was to give examples of general information that would be included in a business plan rather than the financial information requested.
- (c) (i) A number of candidates were able to gain at least some credit for identifying a reason for completing financial documents. Very few candidates could develop their explanation in order to gain full marks.
- (ii) A large number of candidates were unable to identify the reasons a business plan would require updating. The weakest answers simply stated the reasons for drawing up a business plan, such as to gain finance, which could not be credited.

Section B

The most successful candidates in this section were clearly familiar with the case study material and their own enterprise experience, and provided detailed relevant examples within their answers.

Question 6

- (a) It was clear that a number of candidates had clear knowledge and understanding of the 'Lighting Project' case study. Such candidates were able to apply their answers to the particular risks faced by the enterprise described. Such answers often focused upon the risk of training the volunteers or the requirement for Tixy to pay his student loans. Very few candidates provided generalised answers that were not related to the case study.
- (b) This question appeared to be found challenging by a number of candidates. Candidates had strong knowledge of sources of finance and many provided detailed lists of the advantages and disadvantages of each option, but this material needed to be related to the case study enterprise, and where it wasn't, this restricted the marks available. The best answers identified elements from the case study, such as those listed in the mark scheme, and used these points to make a justified decision on the suitability of each source for this enterprise.

Question 7

- (a) Generally candidates demonstrated knowledge of the processes involved in completing a cash flow statement and listed some of the items included in their own statement or forecast. The strongest responses were able to explain and analyse how their cash flow assisted the operation or success of their enterprise. Centres would benefit from revisiting this aspect of the syllabus, particularly the reasons why documents are helpful to an enterprise.
- (b) Candidates were clearly very aware of the parts of the negotiation process and often provided very detailed theoretical knowledge showing what each stage entailed, but this knowledge gained limited credit without context. The most able candidates were able to analyse and evaluate these points in relation to their own enterprise project, providing a justified argument for the most important part for their own enterprise. The most successful responses often focused upon preparation and negotiating their position when requesting supplies or sources of finance. A significant number of candidates did not make clear what good or service they produced or what the negotiation was for, which also limited credit.

ENTERPRISE

<p>Paper 0454/02 Coursework</p>

Key messages

- Candidates must provide relevant evidence of all activities for each task in order to access the full range of marks.
- Activities requiring demonstration of practical enterprising skills were done well.
- Activities which required candidates to show analysis and evaluation skills (AO3) needed to contain more detailed explanation and supporting evidence.
- Whilst candidates can undertake group projects, all reports and documents submitted must be each candidate's own work and not a collaborative effort.
- Assessors are advised to add notes linked to the assessment criteria to the work as this helps with marking and moderating.

General comments

Some centres appear to be confused about the materials that need to be produced for some tasks. For example, a number of candidates included business plans, marketing plans or risk assessments. None of these documents are required by the current syllabus. Guidance on the task descriptors is available from the relevant section of the syllabus that is available from the School Support Hub. There is a checklist in the Coursework Handbook that clearly highlights all the materials candidates must submit. Candidates need to make sure they provide all the required materials to be able to access the full range of marks.

Centres are asked to advise candidates that while they can undertake group projects, all documents produced must be the individual candidates' own work and not a collaborative effort. This includes the Action Plan, examples of marketing communication and the Income and Expenditure Budget. Any work produced jointly by candidates cannot be awarded.

Centres are asked to advise candidates about the word limit. It may be helpful if candidates produce their work as Word documents so that word counts can be easily checked. Teachers can then monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. While candidates are not currently penalised for writing more it is in their interests to follow the guidelines whenever possible.

On the whole, administration was good. In a centre with more than one Enterprise teacher, internal moderation is required to ensure consistency of marks within the centre. Any marks changed should be clearly indicated on the ICRC. The total marks for each candidate need to be the same on all documentation – the ICRC, CASF and the MS1. The marks submitted to Cambridge are those on the MS1, so if changes are made, it is essential that these are transferred to the MS1.

There was limited or no annotation on the work. It would assist the external moderation process if centres show where candidates have demonstrated the relevant assessment criteria. For example writing 'AO1', 'AO2' and 'AO3' or comments such as 'good/excellent analysis' at appropriate points in the work would be helpful. This helps both the centre and Moderator see how and why a particular mark has been awarded.

Candidates were well advised in their choice of suitable projects. Candidates should be congratulated on their choice of projects, which showed true entrepreneurial spirit. Choices for this session included providing stress management products, bath products, food stalls and hairdressing. Such creativity should be encouraged.

Overall, most centres awarded the marks for analysis and evaluation generously. A simple list of advantages and disadvantages or a table, without any accompanying explanation, is not sufficient to constitute analysis. Points need to be developed to show how or why these points need to be considered. For candidates to access the higher mark bands, they must also show depth to their analysis (and evaluation) and this should be seen consistently in all parts of the relevant task.

Evidence should only be included if it is clearly labelled and supports the point being made. Many candidates submitted photographs, permission letters, receipts and screen shots but it was not clear why they had been included.

Comments on specific tasks

Task 1

- The work should be submitted as a formal report and candidates used the correct format. Most candidates attempted to identify entrepreneurial skills, but many found evaluating their own skills in terms of what might be useful for the projects more challenging.
- The second, and main, part of the task involves identifying a suitable project. Candidates should consider the advantages and disadvantages of two (or three) possible options, before deciding which project they will carry out. Candidates must be able to support observations and opinions made with evidence gathered. Evidence might include market research, news articles or costings obtained. Better performing candidates were able to present their data in a meaningful way and then draw valid conclusions from the evidence they had obtained. Others needed to explain points listed in more detail for all options, and use evidence gathered to say why they had chosen one option over other possible alternatives, for example by quoting the results of market research to support decisions made.

Task 2

- All candidates were required to produce an Action Plan, and evidence of either financial planning or marketing communication. Some candidates omitted evidence for at least one element of this task. Typical omissions were the witness statement and two different examples of marketing communication, individually produced by each candidate.
- Most candidates submitted an Action Plan. Instead of monitoring, the majority of candidates described what each stage involved rather than indicate how they would check to know if the action had been completed successfully or not. For example, when selling, keeping books of accounts may be a suitable way to monitor.
- For the second part, there was an equal mix of candidates selecting finance or marketing communication. Written evidence of the candidate's choice was usually included. Candidates should be encouraged to apply points made to their chosen project and develop more detailed explanations in order to access the higher level marks. Many candidates outlined general advantages and disadvantages of different options, but these points could apply to any enterprise, and needed to be focussed on the candidates' own enterprise. Please note that candidates should not rely on the slides alone to provide the necessary level of detail on each option.
- It should be noted that the presentation must relate to their proposals for finance or marketing communications. Some centres confused this task with the negotiation, which forms part of Task 3. Candidates should carry out an individual presentation wherever possible to allow maximum opportunity to demonstrate their enterprise skills. Rather than simply state skills used, assessors are encouraged to provide detailed evidence of specific skills shown during the presentation in the witness statement. This makes it easier for both the assessor and Moderator to confirm these skills.

Task 3

- The marking was generally in line with the required standard for this task. Please note to access the top mark band, candidates must clearly identify, and not just describe, the specific enterprise skills used when carrying out the different activities. For example if they used their initiative when sourcing ingredients, they should state that they used this skill as well as explain how they demonstrated it.
- Some candidates did not provide evidence of planning for a negotiation, which is one of the task requirements. This restricted the mark bands that they could access.
- Candidates should carry out an individual negotiation wherever possible to allow maximum opportunity to demonstrate their negotiating and other enterprise skills.

Task 4

- Most candidates used an appropriate report format including a title, introduction, findings for the two areas, conclusions and recommendations.
- Some candidates discussed more than the two areas, which was unnecessary. As candidates are required to submit a 1000 word report, having a clear focus is essential.
- A number of candidates who selected marketing communications discussed general marketing issues such as market research or pricing. Other areas of marketing should be discussed under the planning and implementation option.
- This task only assesses AO3 analysis and evaluation. Many candidates described or reviewed what was done, which does not demonstrate the required skills. Candidates are also rewarded for the depth of their analysis and evaluation. To do this, candidates would be expected to use words like 'because', 'due to', 'therefore', 'as such' to develop each of the main issues discussed. Many candidates focused too much on what they did, rather than analyse and make judgements about the effectiveness of their chosen areas. The report should cover both successes and failures, as it is not expected that everything will go to plan. Better performing candidates did attempt to consider the implications of points identified, which should be encouraged.
- Most candidates were able to make simple conclusions and recommendations about the success of their project. However, few candidates were able to use evidence collected to support their conclusions, which they need to do to access the higher level marks. Evidence could include customer feedback, the actual costs or income statement. Any relevant evidence should be included in the appendix and clearly referenced in the report.