

ENTERPRISE

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

Key messages

Centres should ensure that candidates are using the current version of the specification. There was some evidence in the answers to **Question 1(b)** and **1(c)** that candidates were referring to an older version. Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates particularly definitions, calculations, and the purpose of sections of the enterprise process. Topic 3.2 specifies that candidates 'should be familiar with named entrepreneurs'. The answers to **Question 1(c)** suggested that some candidates lacked knowledge of this topic. Many candidates continue to confuse Marketing communications and market research an issue in **Question 6(a)**.

The areas which require further attention include, financial terms, calculations, and records (Sections 6.3 and 6.4), Action plans (Sections 7.2) and Marketing communications (Section 8.4). Additionally candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering why entrepreneurs take certain actions or complete documents.

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 and a consideration of the impact on enterprises of decisions made.

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.

- (b) Candidates found this to be a challenging question. The strongest answers stated a way of being enterprising from topic 1.2 of the specification followed by a practical example to show actions they had taken. The mark scheme provides an example of this approach. The weakest answers confused being enterprising with operating an enterprise and described ways they made money. Such responses did not answer the question set and gained no credit.
- (c) (i) Candidates who scored highly on this question stated an enterprise skill from Topic 3.1 of the specification and provided a practical example of how the entrepreneur used that skill. A noticeable number of candidates chose to use their own enterprise. These candidates often gained one mark as the explanations were unclear. Some candidates appeared to be referring to an older version of the syllabus and stated skills which were not creditable.
- (ii) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question. The strongest answers explained how using the skill helped the entrepreneur to succeed for example how innovation created a USP, increasing sales.

Question 2

- (a) A significant number of candidates appeared to have not read the entire question. Such candidates stated general documents not those required in a formal meeting.
- (b) Many candidates gained full marks on this question. The most common correct answer being that emails could be sent to spam folders and not be seen.
- (c) The strongest answers identified a telephone conversation explaining that this would be suitable as the caller could use a persuasive tone and react to the stall holders concerns. Many candidates gained 2 of the 3 marks available by explaining a method with limited reference to the case study.
- (d) This part of the question was generally well answered. The strongest answers provided an example of language used, as directed by the question. The majority of candidates gained 2 marks by explaining that formal language was needed to appear respectful in the meeting.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates were awarded both marks for this definition. Candidates who provided a partial definition frequently did not state that this is as a result of an action or decision taken.
- (b) Candidates struggled to gain all the marks available on this part of the question. The strongest answers identified a method of dealing with risks and then explained how this was used in their own enterprise project. The weakest responses explained the risk that they faced not the method to deal with the risk. Such answers could not be rewarded.
- (c) This term was not well understood by the majority of candidates. Only the strongest responses provided some of the answers listed in the mark scheme. Weaker responses frequently provided very general answers such as 'there are many members who share costs'. These are not defining features of the organisation but could apply equally to a partnership or a limited company therefore they could not be credited.
- (d) Candidates who were unclear about cooperatives struggled with this part of the question. Candidates who had clearly made good use of the case study before the exam scored highly. Such candidates often explained how cooperatives democratic decision making would suit stall holders worried about losing control.

Question 4

- (a) This part of the specification was generally not well understood. Only a few candidates understood the purpose of profit. A significant number of candidates incorrectly thought that profit would be used to pay costs.
- (b) (i) A significant number of candidates did not attempt this calculation. Those that did attempt the question gained both marks.

- (ii) As with **part (b)(i)** a significant number of candidates did not attempt this part of the question. Many stated the correct formula for break even but were unable to identify the correct figure for fixed cost. Such candidates gained one mark.
- (c) Candidates provided a range of correct answers. The weakest answers stated that this was because they had a website. Although this information was in the case study simply stating this did not answer the question asked. The strongest answers explained the greater risk of losing existing customers or the problem of high costs. 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 answers described the contents of an action plan not its purpose. The strongest answers recognised that Temi forgot tasks and explained how this document could help with this problem. Many candidates provided generic answers with no reference to the case study material. Such answers gained 2 marks.
- (b) This topic was generally well understood.
- (c) Candidates often only offered one method, gaining feedback directly from customers, and suggested ways of obtaining this feedback, e.g. questionnaires, interviews, or surveys. These answers were frequently not related to the case study material and gained one mark in total. The strongest answers explained how two methods from the list shown in the mark scheme could be used by Temi to measure customer satisfaction.

Section B

It should be noted that in **Question 7(a)** and **(b)** very little, if any, credit is given to candidates who write an introductory paragraph describing their enterprise experience. Candidates should ensure that each paragraph of their answer relates directly to their enterprise project. A small number of candidates did not attempt questions in this section.

Question 6

- (a) The majority of answers were awarded marks within the bottom of level 2. The strongest answers often described examples of questions that Temi could ask in surveys or questionnaires. Very few candidates explained why the methods chosen would be suitable for researching an ecommerce idea. The weakest answers confused market research with marketing and described the method of advertising to be used. Such answers gained no reward.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the two suggestions using evidence from the case study. Candidates who made use of the calculations from **Question 4** and evidence from the case study scored highly. The strongest answers explained how each option would potentially help to solve some of the problems that the woodcarvers and Temi faced. Weaker answers gained a mark at the bottom of level 2 by stating a benefit of ecommerce or the new marketplace, most frequently this was access to more customers.

Question 7

- (a) This question required candidates to discuss examples from their own enterprise project to show how the enterprise process was helpful. Although candidates clearly understood the different stages in the process many were unable to explain why the stages were important. A mark at the bottom of Level 2 was commonly awarded as candidates provided an example of actions taken at stages in the process. The most common answers being examples of the candidate's action planning or their creative solutions. The strongest answers explained how this planning helped to avoid problems and how their creative solutions allowed them to gain sales. The mark scheme gives an example of this style of answer.
- (b) Candidates seemed confused by the term marketing communications. The strongest answers simply outlined the benefits and disadvantages of each method gaining a mark in Level 2. Candidates did not explain the impact that the chosen communication had on their enterprise project or its sales. Justifications for the rejection of one method were very simplistic and frequently did not contain any reference to their enterprise project.

ENTERPRISE

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

Key messages

Candidates who had thoroughly examined the case study material before the examination scored highly.

Questions which require application, such as **Question 2(b), 2(c)** and **4(b)** were not well answered. Candidates should be reminded to use information from the case study or their own enterprise to help answer such questions as this provides the basis for application and analysis. Many candidates do not provide clear examples within questions when guided to do so. This was an issue within **Question 1(c)** and **Section B** questions.

Analysis is an area which requires further development. Candidates should be reminded that analysis should show the effect of the knowledge on the enterprise or entrepreneur.

Some areas of the specification were not well understood by candidates and require further attention. These include Purpose of business plans (**Section 7.3**), Opportunities (**Section 4.1**) and Meetings and presentations (**Section 10.2**). Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus time considering these sections by practicing financial calculations and discussing the reasons for completing business documentation.

General comments

Section A

Candidates found this paper to be accessible and most were able to achieve marks on the majority of questions. However, **Questions 2(c), 3(b)** and **4(a)** did cause candidates some issues. A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt **Questions 3(a), 3(b)** and **7(b)**.

Some candidates needed to be more precise when defining the requested terms. This was a particular issue in **Question 2(a)**. Weak understanding of business terminology was also a factor in the low marks awarded for **Question 5(c)**.

There was some evidence this session that more candidates were reading the questions thoroughly before starting to write. Although, within **Question 4(b)** and **4(c)** some candidates ignored the instructions given.

Section B

Many candidates continue to find it challenging 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.

Evaluation continues to be a weak area for many candidates. A common error being to restate the points of knowledge as a conclusion. Candidates should be reminded that points can only be credited once within an answer, there is no benefit to be gained by repetition.

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 7a** and **7b**, 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) The majority of candidates were able to correctly define the term. Weaker answers did not gain marks by simply rephrasing the question stating that this is a necessary good. Such answers were too vague to be credited.
- (b) A mark of 2 was common for this question as many candidates identified two reasons but were unable to develop the points made to gain the extra explanation marks. The most common correct answers being taste/fashion and income.
- (c) (i) The most common answers explained how a new enterprise may create jobs. Many candidates made good use of the information provided in the case study and explained how, by providing leisure activities, an enterprise may help to reduce anti-social behaviour.
- (ii) More candidates were aware of the negative effects of enterprise than the positive effects tested in **part (i)**. Although understanding of this concept was very narrow, virtually all correct answers focused on how enterprises create pollution. One or two candidates were aware that monopolies and multinational enterprises can create negative impacts by competing with local enterprises.

Question 2

- (a) The strongest answers provided clear and precise definitions. Weaker answers simply referred to actions that charities may take, such as fundraising, and did not answer the question set.
- (b) Generally, well answered. Many candidates made effective use of the case study and recognised that this enterprise was either aiming to raise US\$3000 or to provide free sports activities for children.
- (c) Candidates found this to be the most challenging question within **section A** of the examination paper. Stronger responses explained why a business plan is produced. Most often this was stated as to help to gain finance. Candidates were not able to apply this information to the enterprise in the case study. The mark scheme provides an example of an answer which does this effectively. Weaker responses had confused the business plan with an action plan and referred to the order that tasks that could be completed.

Question 3

- (a) Well answered by many candidates. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question. Some candidates incorrectly thought that a business plan on its own would identify risks.
- (b) (i)(ii) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt either part of this question. **Part (i)** appeared to be the more difficult question for candidates. The majority of candidates who correctly answered this question focused upon the lack of skilled staff in **part (i)** and inadequate equipment in **part (ii)**.
- (c) This topic was generally well understood with candidates correctly identifying the different attitudes displayed by both Taine and Lucia. A small number of candidates were confused by the question and discussed the fundraising ideas discussed in paragraph 5 of the case study.

Question 4

- (a) This definition was generally not well understood. A mark of 1 was common as candidates were aware that this implied more money coming in than going out of the enterprise.
- (b) Candidates who carefully read the question scored highly. Such candidates often explained how their own funds were insufficient to start the enterprise and therefore they were forced to find other sources. Many candidates simply described two sources of finance not the effect that they had. Such answers could gain a maximum of 2 marks. A small number of candidates discussed crowdfunding and gained zero.
- (c) As with **part (b)** above, candidates who explained crowdfunding gained zero marks. The most successful candidates explained how websites can be used to share information or advertise the product.

Question 5

- (a) The majority of candidates gained both of the marks available. A small number inverted their answers incorrectly stating that **(i)** was a variable cost and **(ii)** fixed.
- (b) Candidates found this to be one of the most straightforward questions in **Section A**. Many gained all of the marks available. A small number of candidates did not attempt this question or only correctly calculated the administration charge.
- (c) This topic was not well understood by many candidates who did not appear to know what was meant by a visual aid or a handout. A noticeable number of candidates thought that these were examples of advertising. Handouts were understood by more candidates than visual aids. The most successful explained how providing a handout allowed the audience to better follow the presentation.

Section B

As in previous years candidates' scored slightly higher in **Question 6a** which related to the case study. **Questions 7a** and **7b** 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 some 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 recognising that the children's club charity could not survive without donations or parents allowing their children to attend. The weakest answers described some of the stakeholders in the question or identified their needs gaining a mark in Level 1.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the evidence in the case study to decide if the benefits of crowdfunding were stronger than the disadvantages. The strongest responses recognised the risks involved in this method of finance. Such candidates made good use of the information contained in paragraph 10 and Fig. 1 of the case study, especially the possible financial cost. Some candidates were confused by the information and simply described what was meant by crowdfunding, gaining a mark in Level 1.

Question 7

- (a) There were some good answers to this question. Candidates clearly understood the methods of market research and were able to describe them in detail. Unfortunately, many candidates did not relate this knowledge to their experience in their enterprise project and a mark at the bottom of Level 2 was common. The most successful candidates gained marks in Level 3 by explaining how the information gathered through the method of research assisted their enterprise. The mark scheme provides an example of a Level 3 style statement.

- (b)** Many candidates found it challenging to answer this question effectively. A noticeable number of candidates did not fully attempt the question. The most successful candidates were awarded a mark at the bottom of Level 3 by explaining why their chosen business organisation was suitable for the operation of their enterprise. The mark scheme shows an example of this type of response. Very few candidates attempted the two-sided approach required for Level 4 answers.

ENTERPRISE

<p>Paper 0454/13 Case Study 13</p>
--

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 3(d)**, **5(b)** and **7(b)**.

Some areas of the syllabus were not well understood by candidates particularly Marketing and selling legislation **3(d)**, Purposes of documents **5(c)** Cashflow forecasts **5(d)** and Sources of help and support **7(a)**. Candidates would benefit from spending more syllabus 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.

Candidates continue to struggle 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 **6(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 confident in their understanding of this area of the specification. Many gained all 3 marks available. Some candidates incorrectly stated completing market research or writing a business plan.

- (b) Candidates found this to be one of the most challenging questions in Section A. A common error was to describe ways of making money or enterprises that the candidate could operate from home not ways of being enterprising.
- (c) Generally, well answered by many candidates. Strong responses identified an enterprise skill from Topic 3.1 and then used an example from the case study to show how Trent had used this skill. A number of candidates identified communication, this not a specific enterprise skill as stated in the syllabus and therefore was not rewarded.

Question 2

- (a) This topic was well understood by the majority of candidates. The most common correct answers being letter and telephone calls.
- (b) Generally, well answered by candidates who explained how planning would have improved the time-keeping and ensured decisions were made. Many candidates gained one mark by stating that she could have chaired the meeting better. Very few candidates gained all 3 marks as they often struggled to provide effective application to the case study material.
- (c) The strongest answers often provided practical examples of their objectives for the meeting and then stated that achieving these meant the meeting was successful. Weaker responses simply stated that the meeting was successful but offered no justification for this decision. Such answers gained no credit.
- (d) Candidates showed a good understanding of this topic with some clear examples of how body language positively affected the meeting. Weaker responses discussed the use of voice not body language and gained zero marks.

Question 3

- (a) A well answered question by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Well answered by many candidates who correctly stated two distinctly different attitudes to risk.
- (c) The strongest answers recognised that the leavers celebration would be offering food which may create a risk of poisoning. An application mark was awarded for reference to the restaurant. A significant minority of candidates had not carefully read the question. Such candidates discussed financial rather than health and safety risks and gained zero marks.
- (d) For many candidates this was the most challenging question within Section A. A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. Many candidates who did attempt the question discussed the methods of marketing that the enterprise should use rather than legal controls on marketing. Stronger answers recognised that key legislation would cover the way the good or service would be described. The mark scheme provides an example of an alternative answer.

Question 4

- (a) Generally, well answered with a range of correct answers being presented most commonly related to the venue or decorations.
- (b) Many candidates gained full marks on this part of the question. A mistake made by some candidates was to not include the cost of buying the hoodie in their calculation. Such candidates gained 1 mark if their method was clearly stated.
- (c) The majority of candidates were able to complete this calculation.
- (d) The strongest answers were able to identify and explain two different sources of finance. The most common correct answers being family and friends or personal savings. The weakest answers chose a method which was clearly inappropriate such as selling shares.

Question 5

- (a) Candidates had a general awareness of the term. Many gained 1 mark by identifying one element, most often that this is a list of tasks.
- (b) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. Weaker responses did not read the question carefully and provided an example of a financial document.
- (c) The strongest answers showed how an action plan would ensure that all tasks are completed on time and ensures team members are kept accountable. Weaker answers simply described the contents of an action plan and did not answer the question set.
- (d) A noticeable number of candidates did not attempt this question. Strong answers recognised the importance of forecasting cashflow to ensure the enterprise does not lack funds. A number of candidates incorrectly thought that cashflow forecasts showed past data or predicted profits.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) Some good answers were presented for this question, although the majority were awarded marks towards the bottom of level 2. The strongest responses made good use of the case study to justify how marketing communications could be used by the school students. The mark scheme provides examples of such answers. Weaker responses described the marketing communications with no attempt to link them to the case study enterprise. Such answers gained a mark in Level 1.
- (b) This question required candidates to evaluate the team working ability of the three students. Candidates who made good use of the material in the case study particularly the last section, scored highly. Such candidates recognised that by not including Meikyla in their decisions the students were not effectively working as a team. Weaker answers simply quoted examples of actions each team member took and gained a mark at the bottom of level 2.

Question 7

- (a) To gain a mark in level 3 on this question candidates needed to explain how the source of help and support assisted their enterprise activity and therefore if it was important to the enterprise. Most candidates gained a mark in level 1 by identifying sources of help and assistance. Stronger responses moved their answer into Level 2 by providing details of the type of assistance offered. Only the very strongest answers attempted to explain whether the source was important to their enterprise or not. Most frequently this was a statement that without the sources of finance the enterprise would not have been able to operate at all. A concern is that many candidates continue to believe that the only help and assistance offered is financial. Such candidates only provide answers focussed upon loans offered by friends and family or banks. This confusion severely limits the candidates ability to gain higher marks.
- (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 actions they had taken during each stage of the process and gained a mark of 4 or 5. Some candidates did not read the question carefully and discussed the success of their enterprise project rather than their negotiation. Such answers did not answer the question set and therefore could not gain credit.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02
Coursework

Key messages

- It is essential candidates use the syllabus for the year of examination. This is to ensure work submitted matches the relevant task descriptors to access the full range of marks.
- Marks for analysis and evaluation continue to be awarded generously. Candidates must provide detailed explanations to develop and justify points made. All points made should clearly link to their chosen project, and not simply outline general theory.
- Assessors should annotate the coursework using 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. The most popular enterprises selected involved making and selling food.
- Candidates must provide evidence for all elements of each task to access the full range of marks. **Section 4** of the syllabus provides clear guidance about what candidates must submit for each task. Many continue to include additional materials including business plans which carry no marks and take up time that candidates could use more productively elsewhere.
- Many candidates showed good knowledge of theory, but there are limited marks available on this component. To do well, candidates must show application, analysis and evaluation skills.
- Most candidates struggled to develop points effectively. A list of points or descriptions 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 in many responses. Application can be shown by using textbook theory and explaining how this is relevant to their project in **task 1** and **2**. Alternatively, they should provide clear examples from the project as evidence for **tasks 3** and **4**.
- Evaluation is more than the decision. It requires candidates to provide 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 relevant tasks. The School Support Hub includes skills exercises to help learners develop the skills of application, analysis and evaluation.
- Most 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 way.
- Assessors must annotate the work 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. This should be done on the work itself, at the point of award. Most centres did not do this.

Comments on specific tasks

Task 1

Nearly every candidate presented the work in a report format. Most candidates were able to identify advantages and disadvantages for two ideas and gathered market research. Candidates should be encouraged to focus on two or three key points for each option, which they then analyse in detail. Better responses developed points and reviewed market research to explain what the results showed. Only the strongest responses used the data to support decisions made. Weaker responses listed theoretical points or included charts without any commentary.

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 results from their market research to help explain why the chosen option was better than the alternative.

Task 2

- (a) Many candidates were able to identify two significant issues. Some included more than three problems, which was unnecessary. Better responses were able to outline problems and offer one possible way they planned to manage each one. Only the best responses offered two detailed solutions for each problem. Without explaining two solutions for each problem the work cannot access Level 3. Weaker responses outlined activities they needed to do as part of their project.

Some candidates presented their work as a risk assessment. This should be discouraged as this format includes complex information such as the severity and likelihood of risk, which is not required at this level. Nor does it 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. Another common mistake was to describe 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, and not what they did.

- (b) 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 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 assessed element for this task is the witness statement. This should focus on communication and enterprise skills shown by the individual during the presentation. Many of the witness statements focused on the content. Where skills were named, there were no details outlining what the candidate did to demonstrate them. Others referenced skills used during the project, rather than the presentation. Some did not include a signed witness statement.

The witness statement and written element must cover the same option. Where this is not the case, the work is likely to be restricted to Level 1.

Task 3

This task was generally well attempted. It was pleasing to see that most candidates included 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 explained why the skill was important without explaining how the individual had used these skills to implement their plan. Without examples from the project the work is limited to Level 1.

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 often generous. **Task 4** is challenging as it only assesses AO3 – analysis and evaluation. Candidates are required to discuss the positive and negative outcomes of two areas – one area must be planning and implementation. Only the strongest responses attempted to analyse key issues. Most reviewed all actions taken which tended to encourage description, not analysis. Such work cannot gain more than Level 2 marks.

Most did not indicate whether points made represented a positive or negative outcome. Candidates should also be encouraged to focus on one significant positive and one negative outcome for each area. Each point should be developed, using phrases such as ‘therefore’, or ‘this means’. This can help candidates develop their observations to explain why they were important and how it affected their project.

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. 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.