

ENTERPRISE

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

Key messages

Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates who displayed gaps in their knowledge particularly of definitions and the use of documents in enterprise. This can be seen in **Section A** of the paper where candidates struggled to achieve on several questions. The areas which require further attention include Ethical considerations (**Section 4.4**), Financial terms, calculations, and records (**Sections 6.3** and **6.4**), Action plans and Business plans (**Sections 7.2** and **7.3**) and Marketing communications (**Section 8.4**). Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering why documents are useful to an enterprise.

Many candidates continue to confuse stakeholders and shareholders, in **Question 1(a)** and **1(b)** and Marketing communications and market research, in **Question 6(b)** and **7(a)**.

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 **Question 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 understood this term but did not give a precise definition, a mark of one was common. The weakest responses confused stakeholders with shareholders and gained zero.
- (b) The strongest responses identified a stakeholder from the case study, explained how they were involved with the enterprise and therefore how its closure would have an impact. The mark scheme provides examples of this approach. The weakest answers either stated shareholders in the enterprise or provided two examples of possible shareholders e.g. Virgil and Rinsola.
- (c) Candidates who scored highly on this question often recognised that the biggest risk would be that customers would not buy the new t-shirts. The weakest answers identified a general risk with no application to the V&R enterprise.

Question 2

- (a) (i) Candidates were generally aware of legal obligations although a many did not provide an example to support their answer.
- (ii) This term was not well understood. Many candidates incorrectly gave examples of legal requirements such as to pay taxes to support their answer.
- (b) Many candidates correctly identified why laws are required in production, with health and safety being the most common correct answer. Some candidates were confused by the question and stated that laws were needed to prevent problems. Such answers were too vague to credit.
- (c) A small number of candidates did not attempt this question. There was some evidence that some candidates did not carefully read this question. Such candidates explained the actions they took to meet laws and regulations but did not explain the impact on their enterprise of those actions. The strongest responses identified that to meet regulations they were required to purchase equipment or undergo training which either increased costs or delayed the start of their enterprise.

Question 3

- (a) Very few candidates were awarded both marks for this question. A common error made by many, was to list financial terms such as profit not the name of the financial record.
- (b) Very well answered. Candidates made good use of the data provided to calculate the required number.
- (c) The strongest answers used the information presented to correctly calculate the figure showing evidence of their working. A few candidates incorrectly rounded their calculation down or presented a figure of 4833.33. Such candidates were able to gain 3 marks if they presented their correct working.
- (d) A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest answers correctly identified that this would mean less t-shirts would need to be sold, often supported by the correct calculation.

Question 4

- (a) This part of the specification was generally well understood. Only the strongest answers were able to provide a clear development of the identified advantage to gain two marks.
- (b) As with **part (a)** of this question candidates were aware of a disadvantage of partnerships but often struggled to develop their point to gain both marks available. A mark of one was common.
- (c) Candidates provided a range of correct answers. The weakest answers identified two sources of finance rather than help and support. The strongest answers explained how their chosen sources would be appropriate for this enterprise. The mark scheme provides an example of such an answer. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 5

- (a) The weakest responses provided examples of items that would be included in a business plan such as aims and objectives. The strongest answers recognised the content of the Operation section. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (b) The purpose of a business plan was not well understood by most candidates. Many simply listed the contents of the plan not its usefulness to an enterprise.
- (c) Candidates found this to be one of the most challenging on the paper. The strongest responses identified that offering trade credit or a discount for second orders would be most likely to work. The weakest answers confused clothing retailers with the customers buying individual t-shirts and provided an answer more suitable for **Question 6(b)**.

Section B

As in previous years candidates' scored more highly in **Question 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 often focused on changes in taste and globalisation. Those that focused on these aspects recognised the potential of new market in another country or new domestic customers. Very few candidates were aware of any other potential benefits of globalisation. The mark scheme provides an example of a possible answer focussing upon the fashion and taste aspect. The weakest answers gained a mark in Level 1 by showing knowledge of the meaning of the terms used in the question.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the benefits and costs of different methods of marketing communications used with retail customers. A mark in Level 2 was common as candidates described posters to be used in store showing pictures of the t-shirts. The weakest answers confused marketing communications (such as advertisements) with market research.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss examples from their own enterprise project. A noticeable number of candidates used the case study example and discussed the selling of t-shirts, therefore not answering the question set. Such candidates often gained a mark in Level 1 as their answers did not show sufficient detail concerning their own planning. Stronger responses explained an aspect of their planning, usually the action plan, and how this helped them to save time or be more focused in their enterprise. The impact of the plan was clearly shown with an example from their enterprise project. The mark scheme gives examples of answers at different levels for this question.
- (b) There was some evidence that candidates did not carefully read this question. Many candidates described the aims and objectives of their enterprise but not how these aims altered the operation of the enterprise project. The most successful candidates identified an aim, explained what actions they had to take to achieve this aim and therefore the limitations this placed upon the ways they could act. Often such answers focused upon profit and explained how the students completed research to ensure their products would sell in their market. The weakest answers showed some understanding of the bullet points in the question but did not apply these to their own enterprise project.

ENTERPRISE

<p>Paper 0454/12 Case Study</p>

Key messages

Candidates clearly struggled with the concepts covered in some questions particularly **2(c)**, **3(d)**, **5(c)** and **7(b)** of this paper. Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates and require further attention include Ethical considerations (**Section 4.4**), Negotiation (**Section 5**), Sources of finance (**Section 6.1**) and Marketing (**Section 8**). Candidates would benefit from spending more time considering these sections practicing financial calculations and discussing the skills needed in negotiation.

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

General comments

Many candidates continue to find it hard to gain marks in Level 3 in **Section B** questions. This was generally due to a lack of analysis of the impact of points raised.

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 **Question 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 define the term. Candidates did not gain marks by defining an entrepreneur not the enterprise.
- (b) A mark of 2 was common for this question as many candidates identified correctly that this was a sole trader organisation and were able to explain what that meant. To gain 3 marks candidates used information from the case study to gain the application mark available. Some candidates incorrectly stated that this was a partnership, because two people were mentioned, showing a lack of awareness that sole traders can employ staff.
- (c) (i) A range of suitable objectives were provided for this question. As with **part (b)** above candidates often found it difficult to apply their answers to the case study and gain the application mark available. A mark of 2 was common. The strongest answers recognised that falling sales in this bakery would make attracting new customers a key objective.

- (ii) Generally well answered. Candidates explained a range of alternative objectives.

Question 2

- (a) An issue with many answers was that candidates identified a way to access secondary research such as the internet, rather than the research itself i.e., articles. The weakest responses confused primary and secondary research and incorrectly gave examples such as interviews.
- (b) Generally, well answered.
- (c) This was a difficult question for many candidates. Although many candidates were able to identify the benefits of market research only the strongest responses answered the question set and discussed the benefits of a questionnaire to this enterprise. A mark of one or zero was common.
- (d) The strongest responses identified a piece of information they had gained through research and then explained how this information had helped them to make a decision. Weaker responses did not achieve marks by describing the research they had completed not the information gained. Such answers could not be credited as they did not answer the question set.

Question 3

- (a) Well answered by many candidates. Some candidates incorrectly thought that price setting was a legal obligation.
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to gain one mark by identifying a consequence of ignoring laws, most frequently a fine or loss of customers. The strongest responses were able to show the effects that this would have in terms of increased cash outflow or loss of revenue. Very few candidates applied their answers to the bakery business therefore very few candidates gained all 2 marks available. The mark scheme provides an example of a successful 3-mark answer.
- (c) This term was not well understood by many candidates. Many gained one mark for recognising that it concerned moral values. Only a few candidates provided a clear and precise definition. A very small number of candidates did not attempt this question.
- (d) Candidates found this to be one of the most challenging questions on the examination paper. The strongest responses explained how Pepijn could donate left over baked goods to charity therefore helping people in the community. Weaker responses confused ethical behaviour with legal requirements often incorrectly discussing the minimum wage required to be paid by law. A small but noticeable amount of candidates did not answer this question

Question 4

- (a) This calculation was generally well answered, with many gaining all the marks available. A small number of candidates confused the cost of deliveries and advertising.
- (b) Candidates who recognised that this purchase was a piece of capital equipment scored highly. Several candidates provided superb answers related to leasing. Many candidates struggled to apply their answer to the enterprise situation and gained a mark of 2.
- (c) As with **part (b)** above, candidates who recognised that this would be a small but ongoing cost scored highly. Many candidates suggested methods that would be unsuitable for this type of cost such as a bank loan.

Question 5

- (a) A mark of 2 was common on this question as candidates were aware of methods of communication but could not explain why they would be suitable to communicate with the shop manager. The strongest answers showed understanding that the owner and manager worked in the same location so would be able to meet face to face.
- (b) Candidates who chose methods suitable for a small local enterprise scored highly. Several candidates were confused by the term marketing communications and discussed either market research or general methods of communication. Such answers could not be credited.

- (c) This topic was not well understood by many candidates who found this to be one of the most challenging questions on the paper. The strongest responses gained 2 marks by giving an example of a non-verbal communication they used. Weaker responses confused non-verbal with written communication and gained zero marks.

Section B

As in previous years candidates' scored slightly higher in **Question 6(a)** which 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 series a small number of candidates did not attempt **Question 7(b)**.

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question. The strongest gained a mark in Level 4 by using an example to show how Pepijn's use of the skill had positively impacted the enterprise. Candidates who gained Level 3 often gave detailed examples from the case study to show the use of the skill in the bakery, most frequently this was delegation and innovation. The weakest responses described some of the skills in the question and gained a mark in Level 1.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the evidence in the case study to choose between the two options presented for development. It was clear that some candidates had considered this question as part of their analysis of the pre-release case study. Such candidates often provided very logical arguments making good use of the material. Candidates who correctly interpreted the data in Fig.1 and Fig. 2 often scored highly. Some candidates were confused by the numbers and stated incorrectly that the delivery option would be cheaper. To gain a mark in Level 4 candidates needed to consider both the benefits and disadvantages of each option before making a choice, only some candidates attempted to do this.

Question 7

- (a) There was some evidence that candidates did not carefully read this question before answering. Several candidates discussed the success or failure of their enterprise with no reference made to the needs and wants of the customers. Such answers gained a mark within Level 1. The most successful candidates gained marks in Level 2 by stating the needs or wants of their customers and then explaining the actions they took to meet these needs. To gain a mark in Level 3 the candidates needed to develop their answers to show the impact that this had on their customers. The mark scheme provides an example of a Level 3 style statement.
- (b) Many candidates struggled to answer this question effectively. As with **part (a)** above there was some evidence that candidates had not carefully read the question before starting the answer. Typically, such students explained the planning and conducting stages of their enterprise project not the negotiation stage as required by the question. The most successful candidates provided examples of their research and the approach they took to conducting the negotiation and gained a mark in Level 2. To move these answers into Level 3 the candidates needed to explain the effect that their planning, or arrangements for conducting, had on the negotiation. 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 entire question being asked. There was clear evidence that some candidates had not read the question fully before starting their answers. In some cases, this meant that very good answers scored zero as they did not answer the question set. This was an issue in **Question 1(b)**, **1(c)** and **7(b)**.

Some areas of the syllabus were not well understood by candidates particularly the enterprise process covered in **Question 1(a)**, stakeholders **3(a)** marketing communications **3(c)** and written communication **3(d)**. Candidates would benefit from spending more time considering why documents are useful to an enterprise.

General comments

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

Many candidates produced strong answers to **Question 6**. Candidates continue to find it difficult to gain the highest marks available in questions which require application of knowledge to both the case study and their own enterprise project.

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

- candidates should be encouraged to learn precise definitions of key terms within the syllabus.
- read the whole question, including the stem carefully, taking note of the command word in the question and instructions such as whether an example is required.
- candidates should be encouraged to make effective use of any calculations produced in **section A** questions to support their analysis in **Questions 6 (a)** and **(b)** if required.
- within **section B** candidates should be encouraged to embed relevant examples from either the case study (**Question 6**) or their own enterprise (**Question 7**), in both their analysis and evaluations.
- when discussing their own enterprise experience, such as in **Question 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) Candidates were not confident in their understanding of this area of the specification. Candidates did not achieve marks by ignoring that steps 1 and 4 had been provided to indicate the correct order.
- (b) Although candidates were aware of the terms needs and wants, they struggled to relate these terms to the case study enterprise, many ignored the key directive in the question to explain the impact. A mark of 2 was common. The strongest answers generally identified the rise in sales of vegan ice cream as a major change. Some candidates did not attempt the question.

- (c) As with **part (b)** of this question candidates often did not attempt to explain the affect of technology. The strongest answers described the technology used in enterprises with little reference to an enterprise. Weaker answers explained the use of WhatsApp to communicate between friends and so did not answer the question set.

Question 2

- (a) (i) This term was not well understood. Weaker answers gave an example of the Fair trade trademark which was not answering the question set.
- (ii) Candidates showed some understanding of the term and gained one mark usually by stating that this was farming without the use of chemicals.
- (b) A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. The most frequent correct answers focused upon the need for adverts for vegan products to be correctly labelled or the health and safety requirements for food products.
- (c) Generally, well answered by candidates who explained a variety of different enterprise risks. The strongest responses often focused upon the financial risks outlined in the case study. Some candidates presented prepared answers concerning the attitude to risk of the entrepreneurs in the case study. Such answers gained no credit.

Question 3

- (a) (i) (ii) A significant number of candidates were unable to provide a correct answer to this part of the question. Most candidates were unaware of how stakeholders are involved in enterprise and therefore what they would look for in a successful enterprise. The strongest answers were able to explain what restaurants would want from their suppliers. Very few candidates understood that the farmers as part of the enterprise would expect orders for their crops.
- (b) Well answered by many candidates who generally focused upon financial help and support offered by governments or friends and family. The strongest answers recognised that this enterprise would require assistance with the organisation of a co-operative and that this may come from other entrepreneurs or consultants.
- (c) The strongest answers recognised that restaurants are not the final consumers of the ice-cream but would buy from the supplier to sell in their restaurants. Such candidates recognised that suitable methods would focus on direct contact with the restaurant. Candidates who identified methods of marketing more suitable for the final consumer were able to gain one mark. A significant minority of candidates explained methods of market research or general communications rather than marketing communications.

Question 4

- (a) Generally, well answered with a range of correct answers being presented. Weaker answers stated financial terms such as loss rather than the name of a document.
- (b) A mark of 1 was common for this part of the question as candidates struggled to develop the points made into explanation. The strongest answers focused on the use of financial documents in gaining further finance from institutions.
- (c) Debt was often confused with loans. Weaker explanations therefore often focused on the borrowing rather than owing of money.
- (d) The strongest responses were able to identify two different benefits such as outlined in the mark scheme and apply these specifically to the case study. Most commonly the correct answers focused upon the need to present this plan to a bank to receive finance or its role helping to organise the enterprise. The weakest answers confused the business plan with an action plan.

Question 5

- (a) Body language was not well understood by most candidates. The strongest answers explained how smiling or showing confidence helped them to succeed in a negotiation or persuade customers to purchase.
- (b) The strongest responses identified an example of written communication that they had used and explained why this was better than verbal methods. The main advantage given being that it provided physical evidence in case of a dispute.
- (c) The strongest answers showed how a business plan, as a handout, could have provided the information farmers requested. Candidates often gained 4 marks by focussing upon how agenda and minutes help meetings be better organised and cover all the information needed in the time allowed. With no reference to the case study meeting such answers could not gain all 6 marks.

Section B

As in previous series candidates' scored more highly in **Question 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 made good use of the numerical information contained in the case study to justify their decisions. Some candidates did not state their overall choice and therefore could not gain a mark at the top of Level 3
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the suitability of two different types of business organisation for the case study enterprise. Candidates did not seem to have a strong knowledge of these business organisations and were often unable to apply points to the case study. Many candidates scored a mark in Level 1 on this question. The strongest answers identified that a limited company may solve two of the problems faced by Divock, lack of finance and the risks of a new product failing although this would not solve the issue of limited almond supply.

Question 7

- (a) To gain a mark in Level 3 on this question candidates needed to explain how using an entrepreneurial skill helped their enterprise activity. Most candidates gained a low Level 2 mark by providing an example of a way the skill was applied. Very few candidates provided examples of the use of two skills as required by the question.
- (b) Candidates found this to be one of the most challenging questions on the examination paper. A noticeable number of candidates made no attempt to answer the question. The strongest responses provided examples of how they had chosen evidence for their negotiation and gained a mark of 4 or 5. Weaker answers discussed the planning of their enterprise project not the negotiation and gained zero marks.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02
Coursework

Key messages

- It is essential candidates use the syllabus for the year of examination. This is to ensure the work submitted matches the relevant descriptors for each task.
- Candidates do not need to include additional documents such as business plans as there are no marks available for producing them.
- Marks for analysis and evaluation continue to be awarded generously. Candidates must provide detailed explanations to develop and justify points made. Points made should clearly relate to their chosen project, and not simply 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. Food related activities continue to be the most popular option. There is nothing wrong with this, as the project selected must be feasible for candidates to carry out.

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 additional materials which is unnecessary. This wastes time which candidates could use more productively on other activities.

Most candidates struggle to develop points effectively. A list of advantages and disadvantages or descriptions of what they did is not analysis. Please note, candidates do not need to comment on every point identified. They should be encouraged to focus on a few key points, which they can then analyse in detail. Good analysis means each point being further developed to show the consequences of an action. For example, because of this X happened, which (could) lead to Y, and therefore Z. Each point should be in context. Context means using examples from the project as supporting evidence.

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.

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 were able to identify advantages and disadvantages for at least two ideas and gathered market research. Better performing candidates did attempt to develop points and presented data collected in an appropriate chart format and reviewed what the results

showed. Only the strongest responses attempted to use the data to support decisions made. Weaker responses listed theoretical points or included charts without commenting on the results. All candidates should be encouraged to develop key points showing why each one is significant, either in a positive or negative way. When making a final decision, 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 more than three problems, which was unnecessary. Better responses were able to outline problems and offer suggestions about how they planned to manage each one. Only the best responses attempted to include a selection of solutions for each problem, which was necessary for the work to be considered for Level 3 marks. Weaker responses tended to identify problems and solutions which could apply to any enterprise and some simply outlined activities they needed to do to complete their action plan. Others described actions taken retrospectively. Candidates need to be reminded that this is a planning activity so the work must be forward looking – focusing on what they might do, and not what they did.

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

- (b) Most 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) and linked points to their enterprise. Weaker responses stated general advantages and disadvantages of each option but did not apply the theory to their project. Without context, candidates cannot 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 enterprise and communication skills shown by the individual during the presentation, and not summarise the content. Some candidates named skills but did not provide any details outlining what they did to demonstrate these skills.

Several candidates did not include a signed witness statement. Without clear evidence of both parts of this task, this is likely to restrict the work to Level 1.

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. Others stated why they needed the skills instead of providing examples as to how they had used these skills to implement their plan. Some commented on the success of their monitoring which was unnecessary.

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 marks awarded for this task were generous. **Task 4** is challenging as only it only assesses analysis and evaluation. Candidates are required to discuss the positive and negative outcomes of two areas – one of which must be planning and implementation. These successes and failures should be clearly stated and not

simply implied. For each area, candidates should focus on no more than three significant issues, including one positive and one negative outcome. Each point should be developed, using phrases such as 'therefore', or 'this means'. These connective words can help candidates develop their observations to explain the consequences or significance of issues for their project. Only the strongest responses attempted to analyse key issues. Most responses simply described actions taken. Such work cannot gain more than Level 2 marks.

Some candidates did offer simple conclusions and make recommendations for improvement. However, only a small number of candidates used evidence collected to support their conclusions. Many 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.