

ENTERPRISE

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

Key messages

Candidates would benefit from greater practice in developing answers fully. This is particularly an issue in questions where the command word is 'explain' such as in **Question 4(c)** and **5(a)**. In such questions candidates are frequently not fully developing their correctly identified points, and achieving limited credit as a result.

A small number of candidates applied all of their answers to **Section B** questions to their own enterprise experience. Candidates should be reminded that where an enterprise is specified in the question, either the enterprise in the case study or the candidates' own enterprise, their response should be applied to the enterprise specified, in order to answer the question set.

In **Question 7**, a number of candidates wrote an introduction to their answers stating the product or service that they produced during their enterprise experience. Although this is good practice and helps the Examiner to put answers into perspective, such introductions do not, on their own, gain the candidate access to marks above Level 1 and they should therefore be brief. To gain application marks within **Question 7**, the candidate must ensure that examples are given to show how each point raised applies to their own enterprise experience.

General comments

It was evident that Centres had worked hard on candidate's examination technique. This was particularly noticeable within **Section B** of the paper where candidates were able to apply their knowledge to both their own enterprise experience and to the case study material.

There was some evidence that candidates were not fully confident in their knowledge of some aspects of the syllabus, especially Topic 9, Help and support for enterprise and Topic 4.3, The implication of rights, responsibilities and ethical considerations. A small number of candidates did not attempt some questions, notably **Questions 2(b)**, **3(a)** and **7(b)**.

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

- Ensure that candidates are aware of all aspects of the syllabus.
- Use the case study material to identify key concepts that candidates will be expected to apply during the examination.
- Candidates would benefit from further guidance and practice in how to develop answers to gain explanation marks.
- Within **Section B** questions, candidates would benefit from further practice in structuring answers to illustrate analysis and evaluation skills.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) (i) Candidates had a good knowledge of this concept and many obtained both of the marks available. A common incomplete answer was to state that profit can be calculated by revenue minus costs, which could calculate a loss or a profit.
- (ii) This question was well answered by many candidates who were able to show their knowledge of section 4.3(b) of the syllabus. A small number of candidates confused being ethical with following the law.
- (b) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (c) The strongest responses identified the objective, such as to maximise profit, explained the action taken to achieve that objective and then explained how this action helped their enterprise achieve the objective. Weaker responses simply stated the objectives. Such answers could not be rewarded as the question focus was on the effect of the objectives on the way the enterprise operated.

Question 2

- (a) Many responses gained full marks and clearly understood the benefits and costs of teamwork.
- (b) A significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest responses identified a source of support as indicated in Section 9 of the syllabus. They then used the case study material to explain how that source of support was, or could have been, used by this enterprise. A small number of candidates discussed the support that they received in their own enterprise experience, which was not the focus of the question and did not answer the question set. Such answers could be credited for correct knowledge, but this was limited.

Question 3

- (a) A number of candidates were not able to identify the ways consumers are protected by laws. A small but significant number of candidates did not attempt this question. The strongest answers focused upon the safety of products and the truthfulness of advertising materials.
- (b) Candidates were generally confident in their understanding of this topic area. A wide variety of correct answers were provided.
- (c) Candidates did not appear to be as comfortable in their ability to apply their knowledge to this question. Very few candidates were able to offer detailed applied answers and gain all of the marks available. Strong answers identified why a particular risk would cause problems for the candidate's enterprise and therefore how identifying the risk helped them to avoid those problems.

Question 4

- (a) Although candidates were aware of the difference between short and long term planning, very few were able to give precise definitions and appropriate examples. Most candidates achieved limited marks for this question.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates achieved full marks available for this question.
- (c) There were a number of strong responses to this question with answers developed in a way consistent with the examples in the mark scheme. A number of candidates identified a purpose of planning, such as to prevent overspending, but were not always able to develop their answers to show how this helps an enterprise.

Question 5

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to identify two appropriate points of knowledge and gain a mark for both the advantage and disadvantage. As with **Question 4(c)**, the development of the points identified was often lacking.
- (b) Candidates were less successful in this part of the question. The most successful responses identified a method of research and gave a practical example of how B&K revision could use that research. They then explained why this was a suitable method for this enterprise, usually this was in terms of reaching the correct target market or being low cost. A large number of candidates simply stated primary or secondary research, such answers were not creditable as these are not methods of market research.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There was a range of answers to this question but the majority scored marks within Level 2 of the mark scheme. The strongest answers focused on how financial planning would assist B&K Revision Sheets to reduce the risk of overspending. Such answers often considered the particular financial issues facing a co-operative organisation. Weaker answers focused on what would be included in a financial plan rather than its purpose. These candidates but did not relate this knowledge to the information in the case study to show how the planning would have helped the enterprise. Such answers could only be awarded a mark at Level 1.
- (b) Candidates had good knowledge of the case study. The strongest answers provided detailed explanations of each of the factors before reaching a justified decision as to the importance of each in this situation. The strongest answers recognised that the customers for this enterprise would be candidates revising for examination, therefore the price of the sheets and the quality of content would be very important. Candidates who recognised this scored highly.

Question 7

- (a) The most successful candidates used detailed practical examples to show how they reviewed the progress of their enterprise activity. Such candidates gained analysis marks in Level 3 by then illustrating the impact that such reviews had upon the successful running of the enterprise. Only the strongest answers considered the negative impact of taking time to review progress. Frequently this impact was in terms of increased costs or time spent in meetings. The weakest responses identified the questions that would be considered during such a review with no application to their own work.
- (b) Strong answers included examples of communications used with stakeholders and an explanation of both why they had been successful and any problems encountered. Very few candidates offered a fully supported conclusion evaluating the success of methods within their enterprise experience, as they often did not consider the disadvantages of the methods chosen. Weaker responses listed the advantages and disadvantages of methods of communication with no reference to how they were used in their enterprise.

ENTERPRISE

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

Key messages

Candidates should be reminded to take careful note of the skills required in the answers to each question, as signaled by the command words.

A trend was for candidates to write an introductory paragraph for each of the essays in **Section B**, outlining either the case study information or the product that they produced in their own enterprise experience. Although an overview of the candidates' own enterprise is helpful for the Examiner, such introductions do not, on their own, gain the candidate access to marks above Level 1 and they should therefore be brief. Candidates should be encouraged to apply each point they make throughout their answers to the enterprise specified within the question.

Questions 6(a) and (b) required answers that focused application on the enterprise stated in the case study. **Questions 7(a) and (b)** required application to the candidates' own enterprise experience. Candidates' responses should be applied to the enterprise specified, in order to answer the question set.

General comments

A number of candidates had clearly made good use of their examination preparation time to apply the concepts raised in the case study material to their own enterprise experiences. Such candidates scored very highly, especially in **Section B**.

The main issue, especially with **Section B** questions, is that some candidates answer the questions generically and do not apply their responses to the enterprise specified in the question. Candidates who do this will not be able to access marks in the levels above Level 1.

There were very few instances of candidates not completing the paper, showing good time management skills. However there were some instances of candidates not attempting some of the questions, mainly **Questions 1(c)(ii), 4(a)(ii) and 7(b)**.

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

- Use the case study material to identify key concepts and terminology that candidates may be expected to apply during the examination.
- An introduction to answers in **Section B** should not be used as evidence of application; candidates should give examples from their own experience or the case study throughout their answers.
- Within **Section B** questions, candidates should be encouraged to produce a two-sided argument particularly in **Questions 6(b) and 7(b)**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Generally very well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (b) Many candidates gained full marks. A number of candidates repeated the same reason using different wording.
- (c)(i)(ii) A large number of candidates appeared to find both parts of this question challenging. The strongest responses identified a clear example of where they had utilised the skill and then explained this with developed points including how the skill had helped their learning. The benefits explained for technology were usually the speed with which they could research and with numeracy the advantage of correct calculations of financial data within their enterprise project. However many candidates had difficulty in clearly identifying relevant examples and instead provided general discussions of the benefits of technology and numeracy. Such answers could not be rewarded.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates clearly understood this topic area and many were able to identify suitable examples from the case study, such as those outlined in the mark scheme. Weaker responses were unable to show how team working assisted the operation of the enterprise.
- (b) This question covered topic 3.1(b) of the syllabus. The strongest answers gave clear examples of how the identified skill had been used within this enterprise identifying the impact. For example, 'Shivani and Alison demonstrated resourcefulness by producing the board game and making it look much better despite their limited resources.' Very few candidates were unable to identify two valid enterprise skills.

Question 3

- (a) (i) This term was well understood, however the examples provided were sometimes too vague to be creditable.
- (ii) This term was less well defined than primary research. A common error with the examples provided was to simply state 'the internet' which on its own was insufficient to be credited.
- (b) Candidates who clearly focused their answers on their own enterprise experience generally scored well on this question. Often however candidates identified a relevant PESTEL factor and discussed general points with no reference made to their own enterprise. Such answers gained limited credit for relevant knowledge only.

Question 4

- (a) (i) This question was not well answered. A common mistake was to give examples of formal and informal communication rather than explain the difference between the two.
- (ii) A small, but significant, number of candidates did not attempt this question. Those candidates who did attempt the question generally gained both of the marks available. A number of candidates stated that 'minutes' relate to a period of time.
- (iii) This question generated a range of responses. Generally candidates were aware of a business plan but many confused the two terms.
- (b) This part of the syllabus was well understood by many candidates who gained all of the marks available. A number of candidates used the word 'running' instead of 'owning' which led to incorrect or incomplete responses.

Question 5

- (a) This part of the syllabus was well understood by many candidates who gained full marks. Many correct answers focused upon the persuasive and informative purpose of marketing.
- (b) A common answer to this part of the question was to explain the limited funds available through personal savings, or the risky nature of such investment. Only the strongest responses were able to develop their explanations fully to gain full marks.
- (c) This question was generally well answered with candidates identifying a range of financial records. Vague statements such as financial spreadsheets were not creditable responses.
- (d) Candidates were less successful in this part of the question. The most successful responses identified correctly why financial records needed to be kept but most were unable to explain why it is important that they are accurate.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) A range of answers were provided to this question but the majority scored marks within Level 1 or 2 of the mark scheme. To score higher marks, candidates needed to have a thorough understanding of the case study material. The best answers used the evidence in the case study to explain how the opportunities listed would impact, both positively and negatively, upon the case study enterprise.
- (b) Candidates clearly had good knowledge of methods of communication and many applied this knowledge effectively to explain suitable methods to reach the target market of teachers and candidates. Very few candidates provided an evaluative discussion by considering both the positives and negatives of the methods suggested. This was required in order to access marks within Level 4. A few candidates confused market communications with market research.

Question 7

- (a) This question was not well answered by many candidates. The strongest answers made good use of examples from the enterprise meetings organised by the candidates themselves to contextualise problems. Most candidates did not explicitly relate the factors in the question to their own meetings but discussed general points relating to the running of meetings. Such answers gained limited credit. The weakest candidates discussed how the lack of time affected the running of the whole enterprise project. Such answers, by disregarding the focus on meetings, did not answer the question set and could not be credited.
- (b) In order to access marks above Level 1, candidates needed to give specific examples of their own planning and discuss the importance or unimportance of this to the operation of their enterprise project. A large number of candidates did not specifically state the details of the planning that they had been involved in but gave a theoretical account of general planning. Such answers gained very limited credit.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/13
Case Study

Key messages

Candidates should be reminded to take careful note of the command words in each question. A question that requests the candidate to use an example cannot be fully answered without one. Candidates would benefit from greater practice in developing answers fully. This is particularly an issue in questions where the command word is 'explain', such as in **Question 1(b)** and **2**. In such questions candidates were not always able to fully developing their correctly identified points.

Within **Section B** questions candidates must focus their answers upon application to the enterprise stated in the question. **Questions 6(a)** and **(b)** required answers that focus application on the enterprise stated in the case study. **Questions 7(a)** and **(b)** required application to the candidates' own enterprise experience. Candidates' responses should be applied to the enterprise specified, in order to answer the question set. A number of candidates wrote an introduction to their answers in **Question 7** stating the product or service that they produced during their enterprise experience. Although this is good practice and helps the Examiner to put answers into perspective, such introductions do not on their own gain the candidate access to marks above Level 1 and they should therefore be brief. To gain application marks within **Question 7** the candidate needed to ensure that examples were given to show how each point raised applied to their own enterprise experience.

General comments

It was evident that Centres had worked hard on candidate's examination technique. This was particularly noticeable within **section B** of the paper where candidates were able to apply their knowledge to both their own enterprise experience and to the case study material.

Candidates were clearly familiar with all aspects of the syllabus and some demonstrated extremely strong knowledge.

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

- Pay careful attention to the wording of questions particularly the command word and the focus required for any application.
- Ensure that examples are included where required by the question.
- Answers that require short responses will be signalled by the command word 'state'. Candidates should practise developing knowledge points to gain full marks when the command word is 'explain'.
- Within longer mark questions, candidates would benefit from guidance and further practice in structuring answers to illustrate AO2 and AO3 skills.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) (i)** Candidates had a good knowledge of this concept and many obtained both of the marks available. A small number of candidates did not include an example.

- (ii) As with part (i), this question was well answered by many candidates, although some candidates did not include an example in their answers.
- (b) (i) This question required candidates to apply their knowledge to actions they had taken. The strongest answers identified a clear example of an action they had taken and then explained how this related to showing initiative with details of the outcome of the action. A wide variety of answers were developed in this way.
- (ii) Problem solving appears to be an area of strength for many candidates who scored highly on this question. The weakest responses did not extend their answer sufficiently to show the result of the action they had taken to solve the problem, and gained limited credit.

Question 2

- (a) A number of candidates identified a challenge that they had faced and then explained how they had overcome this challenge, but this was not the focus of the question and such developments could not be credited. The strongest answers included an identified challenge generally faced by enterprises, a specific example of how this challenge was faced within the candidate's own enterprise and the impact that this had upon the enterprise.
- (b) The best answers to this question identified a reward, gave a precise example from the candidate's enterprise and then explained why this was rewarding. Weaker candidates struggled to develop their answers sufficiently to gain all of the marks available.
- (c) The strongest responses used practical examples to show the actions that a named entrepreneur had taken and how these had led to great things happening. A wide variety of well known entrepreneurs were used to provide detailed examples. The weakest response explained what being an entrepreneur means, and a very small minority of candidates did not attempt this question.

Question 3

- (a) (i) This was generally well answered, although a number of candidates struggled to fully develop their answers in order to gain full marks.
- (ii) As with part (i), candidates frequently struggled to fully develop the points that they identified.
- (b) (i) Very well answered by the majority of candidates.
- (ii) Candidates did not appear to be as confident in their understanding of these terms. The majority of candidates understood the meaning of 'word of mouth' but struggled with 'sponsorship'. Very few candidates identified the key characteristics that word of mouth is free and uncontrollable whilst sponsorship is paid for.
- (iii) These terms appeared to cause some confusion. Very few candidates correctly explained credit. A number of candidates defined creditor and debtor rather than the words required.

Question 4

- (a) The vast majority of candidates gained both marks available for this question.
- (b) Strong answers showed a clear understanding of how social enterprises operate. Such candidates were able to give precise and detailed explanations. Some candidates appeared to be unsure of this aspect of the syllabus. Such candidates often defined what is meant by a social enterprise, which could not be credited. A number of candidates provided examples of generic advantages and disadvantages, such as raising finance, which could apply to a number of different business organisations. Such answers could gain very little credit unless they were specifically explained in the context of the operation of a social enterprise.
- (c) Candidates were aware of the risks that they faced and many identified an action that they had taken to reduce that risk. Only the most able candidates fully developed their answers to show how the action taken had impacted upon the risk.

Question 5

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to identify two appropriate examples and gain full marks.
- (b) As with part (a), very few candidates were not able to provide two relevant examples.
- (c) Although many candidates were able to identify reasons for producing a business plan, fewer were able to fully develop the points made in order to gain full marks.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There was a range of answers to this question but the majority scored marks within Level 2 of the mark scheme. The best answers focused upon the problems with the meeting as identified within the case study, and then explained how proper organisation of a formal meeting would have reduced those problems. Weaker responses focused upon their own enterprise experience rather than the enterprise within the case study, and gained limited credit.
- (b) Candidates clearly had knowledge of this topic area and many provided detailed answers highlighting the benefits and costs of using technology or government policies. As with part (a) of this question, lack of application to the pre-released material meant that several candidates gained limited credit. Stronger responses identified problems within the Kersley Village Arts Project and related these to the bullet points in the question. After a detailed consideration of the benefits and costs of the situation a reasoned conclusion was drawn as to the importance of two of the factors.

Question 7

- (a) The most successful responses used detailed examples to show how the objectives they set had impacted upon their enterprise experience. Frequently this impact was in terms of increased costs or time spent researching ways to reduce costs. The very strongest responses considered both the positive and negative aspects of their chosen objectives. A small number of candidates simply stated generic enterprise objectives and were unable to apply those to their own enterprise experience.
- (b) Candidates were aware of the methods that enterprises could use to increase customer satisfaction, the most common answers being rewarding loyalty and improving quality. Some candidates struggled to apply this knowledge to their own enterprise experience and were therefore unable to access marks above Level 1. The strongest answers provided examples of methods that were or could have been used within their own enterprise. The advantages and disadvantages of these methods were discussed before a conclusion was made, suggesting the most appropriate method for their own situation. A number of answers focused upon why retention of customers is important, rather than the methods to achieve this, which could not be credited.

ENTERPRISE

Paper 0454/02
Coursework

Key messages

- Candidates must provide relevant evidence of all activities for each task.
- 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.
- While candidates can undertake group projects, all the 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

A number of centres appear to be confused about the type of evidence that they need to produce for some tasks. For example, a number of candidates included business plans, marketing plans or risk assessments, none of which 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 evidence that candidates need to submit. Candidates need to ensure 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 credit.

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 a large number of candidates and more than one teacher, internal moderation must be carried out. This is not intended to be a remarking exercise, and any marks changed should be clearly indicated on the ICRC. The total marks for each candidate also 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. Overall the level of annotation on the work was limited. It would assist the external moderation process if the centres identify where candidates have demonstrated the relevant assessment criteria. For example writing AO1, AO2 and AO3, or comments such as 'good analysis' or '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 ranged from providing a packed lunch service, inflatable boxing contests, bleached clothing and photo printing services. Such creativity should be encouraged.

Overall, many centres awarded analysis and evaluation generously. A simple list of advantages and disadvantages or a table, without any accompanying explanation, does not constitute analysis. Points need to be developed to explain 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.

Comments on specific tasks

For Task 1, candidates are required to submit a formal report. All candidates used the correct format. Most candidates did attempt 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 part of the task involved identifying a suitable project. For this they should explore the advantages and disadvantages of two or three possible options, before deciding which one they will carry out. It is not sufficient that candidates give their opinion or state a choice. Candidates must be able to support observations made with evidence gathered. Evidence might include market research, news articles or costings obtained. Stronger pieces of coursework communicated the process and outcome of the candidate's investigations when choosing their project. Data was presented in a meaningful way and candidates were able to draw valid conclusions from the data they had obtained. Other pieces of coursework needed to explore points listed for the different options, and use evidence gathered to say why the candidate had chosen one option over other possible alternatives, for example by quoting the results of market research.

For Task 2, candidates are required to present evidence of business planning. Many assessors were generous in their marking, and as little or no evidence of how they had arrived at their marks was included, it was difficult to see how some marks had been rewarded. All candidates were required to produce an Action Plan, and evidence of either financial planning or planning marketing communications. 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 the candidate.

Most candidates did submit an Action Plan. Instead of monitoring, the majority of candidates described what each stage involved rather than state how they would check to know if the action had been completed.

For the second part, there was an equal mix of candidates selecting finance or marketing communications. Written evidence of the candidate's choice was usually included. Candidates should be encouraged to develop more detailed explanations in order to access the higher mark bands. For example, rather than outline general advantages and disadvantages of different options, they should focus on explaining why these methods might be appropriate for their particular business. However candidates need to be advised that they should not rely on the visual materials as the medium for this, as this does not allow candidates to analyse the issues in sufficient depth.

It should be noted that the presentation must relate to their proposals for finance or marketing communications. Some centres confused this 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 the skills shown.

A number of candidates included additional documents including a risk assessment and business plan, which are unnecessary. Whilst both documents can provide some additional detail they should not replace the documents required by the task.

For Task 3, candidates are required to provide evidence of preparation for negotiation and a written record of how they had implemented their action plan. The marking was generally in line with the required standard. However 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. A number of candidates did not provide evidence for both parts of the tasks.

For Task 4, candidates are required to produce a formal report. Nearly all candidates used an appropriate layout. In terms of content, candidates do not need to comment on all four areas. If marketing communications is selected, they should not discuss general marketing issues such as market research or pricing. If candidates cover all areas they will not be able to discuss and validate their findings in sufficient detail to gain the higher level marks. As candidates are only required to submit a 1000 word report, having a

clear focus is essential. Candidates are 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 their points. Many candidates focused too much on what they did, rather than analyse and make judgements about the effectiveness of their chosen areas. This should cover both successes and failures. A review of what was done does not show the analytical or evaluative skills required by this task. Better pieces of coursework did attempt to consider the implications of points identified, which should be encouraged. The majority of the coursework submitted made simple conclusions and recommendations about the success of their project. Fewer pieces of coursework used evidence collected to support their conclusions, which they need to do to merit a high mark.