



# Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE  
In Commerce (4CM1) Paper 01

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2023

Publications Code 4CM1\_01\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## GENERAL COMMENTS

As reported in previous series candidates are finding the paper more accessible than previous series as they were able to complete it in the given time. For the majority of the questions candidates were well prepared and were able to apply their knowledge, analyse and evaluate to answer the questions. However, again as mentioned in previous reports there are still a number of candidates who struggle, as in previous years with the 'State' questions.

Many candidates had gained a great deal of commercial understanding from studying the course and this was apparent in the answers given. However, there are a number of candidates who are answering the questions detailing their knowledge of the topic without giving any application, analysis, or evaluative comments when the question is analyse or justify or evaluate. This does restrict the candidates' access to the full range of marks. The various scenarios throughout the paper are of real-life commercial operations, which perhaps interests some candidates and this meant that they were able to relate their comments more easily to the questions.

The mark scheme includes the Assessment Objectives to help in the preparation of candidates for future examinations. Just to reiterate, that all four of the Assessment Objectives (AO's) are covered throughout the paper and the percentage breakdown of each AO can be seen on page 31 in the Specification. Also, on page 44 of the Specification, are examples of the command words used. For example, in question 2 (g) and 3 (f) the command word is 'Justify' and candidates are asked to write an extended answer, using information provided in order to recommend one of the two options to a commercial operation.

It is important that candidates take into account the marks allocated for each question, giving them guidance on the amount of detail they need to answer the question.

Further more, it is also worth mentioning, that if candidates need additional sheets of paper they must indicate if they have continued their answer somewhere else on the paper or have added additional sheets. Unfortunately, there are still a few who did not and they may have missed some valuable marks. For those candidates that used additional paper, their response to the questions must be clearly identified on the paper. It is also important that candidates clearly label the additional pages to show which question they are continuing with. Examiners are unable to guess if a candidate has continued the answer somewhere else. Candidates must clearly indicate by indicating, 'continued', 'contd page ....' or 'see separate sheet' or something along those lines.

There are also some candidates who do not follow the instructions of the examination paper, for the multiple choice questions candidates are given the instruction to mark an

'X' in the box. There are some candidates who are using 'ticks' which may not be picked up as these questions are marked by computer.

It is worth noting that questions can be taken from any part of the specification; therefore, centres should ensure that all sections are covered so that they do not disadvantage any candidates. From the work seen it appeared that some candidates had difficulty answering certain topics.

## COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

### SECTION A

#### Question 1

In part 1 a – over three quarters of the candidates gained the mark for identifying the temporary document issued whilst waiting for an insurance policy. Candidates should be reminded that if they do make a mistake when answering a multiple choice question, they should put a line through the wrong answer and an 'X' through the correct response. A candidate that marks two answers will not gain any marks.

In part 1 b – again well answered by the majority of candidates with over three quarters of the cohort gaining the mark available on indicating which one would be a customer of a cash-and-carry wholesaler.

In part 1 c – a define question where candidates had to define the term logo. This was not as well answered by candidates and only half of the cohort gained the mark available. From responses seen, many candidates identified it as a picture or brand which is not a logo.

In part 1 d – another define question, where candidates had to define the term compensation. Just over half of the cohort gained the mark for this question, showing that the majority of candidates understood what the term meant. From the responses seen a number of candidates, referred to compensation, as being something that has gone wrong and needed to be put right, but it is not an actual definition. Candidates should be encouraged to avoid using the term straight from the question when answering as this does not always show what the definition is.

In part 1 e (i) – a calculation question, where candidates had to work out the cost of the shoes. Just over two thirds of the candidates gained the two marks for this question. It is worth reiterating to candidates to show their workings within the box, as they may have the correct formula and figures but the actual calculation was incorrect. Also, candidates should be encouraged to ensure that the figures written are clear and easily readable, thus avoiding any confusion.

In part 1 e (ii) - this is the first of the 'State' questions where candidates must relate their response to the scenario. As in previous series just over a third of the cohort gained the mark available. Although from the responses seen candidates understood the effect on Surfdomo of having summer sales, but then did not put it in context and therefore did not gain the mark. Just putting summer sale in the response does not guarantee the mark

– as summer sale is in the question, an example needs to be included such as Vans shoes to gain the mark.

In part 1 e (iii) – another state question. Candidates had to give a reason why Surfdomo sells its own label products. Very few candidates gained this mark and from the responses seen as it was not in context.

In part 1 f – a question where candidates could have developed their answers more to gain the full 3 marks available. Over half of the candidates did not gain a mark on this question on a topic of the role of an insurance assessor. A number of candidates may have misread the question and from responses seen given more than one reason. It is important that candidates read the question carefully before answering. The question asked for one reason as opposed to two, and on this occasion as it is an explain question, the response did not have to be in context and candidates could demonstrate their knowledge of the topic. Most candidates appeared to have confused the role of the assessor with the role of the actuary.

In part 1 g – candidates were asked to give one way a shop might deal with a complaint made by a customer. Only a quarter of the cohort did not gain a mark on this question. Over half of the cohort were able to gain one or two marks. There were many responses from candidates as a variety of ways that a shop could deal with a complaint, but again only one reason was required and candidates then had to develop that reason rather than giving additional reasons. It was anticipated that candidates understood this question as they may have come across it whilst shopping with friends.

In part 1 h – this is the first question in the paper which is marked by levels. Candidates were asked to analyse the impact on customers of UO Superstore from the introduction of the new click and collect service. To gain the marks available candidates needed to apply their knowledge and analyse it to the scenario. Nearly a third of the cohort understood the impact on customers and gained a Level 1 mark, with half gaining a Level 2 mark. Candidates should be encouraged to ensure that they apply the knowledge given and then analyse it to gain the higher level.

## Question 2

In part 2 a – a multiple choice question where candidates had to identify what would be the premium a customer would pay with a 14.5% increase. Nearly three quarters of the cohort gained the mark available.

In part 2 b – a multiple choice question where candidates had to identify which one of the options was an example of manufacturing. This proved to be a well answered question with nearly the whole cohort gaining the mark available. Perhaps because it was a topic, that candidates are extremely familiar with.

In part 2 c (i) – candidates had to look at figure 1 and then identify which insurer offered the lowest price for insurance. Again over 90% of candidates were able to choose the correct insurer gaining the mark available.

In part 2 c (ii) – again candidates had to refer to figure 1 and identify the highest price of insurance for a couple, this was not as well answered with only a third of the cohort gaining the mark available. Perhaps some candidates had not read the question properly and gave the highest price of insurance for an individual.

In part 2 d – a define question where candidates were asked to define utmost good faith. Nearly two thirds of the candidates gained the mark for this question. As mentioned, candidates are encouraged not to use the words in the question when giving a definition as it does not always show a true definition of the term/word/phrase.

In part 2 e – this question was an ‘explain’ hence candidates did not need to put their response into context. Only the use of knowledge is required to answer the question. Nearly three quarters of candidates did not gain any marks on this question. The question asked for one advantage for a customer of using mail order. This question was not as well answered as expected, especially as most people are very familiar with mail order and it is used throughout the world by a large majority of people. From the responses seen some candidates gave the advantage to the business/company as opposed to the customer. A fifth of the cohort did not gain a mark on this question and nearly a third gained the full 3 marks available. Candidates should take care in reading the question carefully to ensure they answer what is asked.

In part 2 f – nearly a third of the cohort gained full marks on this question. As it was another ‘explain’ question, so candidates do not have to put their response in context. From the responses candidates did understand the disadvantages of a business partnership. It is important that candidates do read the question carefully to ensure they know exactly what they are answering. There were varied responses to this question and some candidates confused disadvantages with advantages.

In part 2 g – again this is a question that is marked by levels. Candidates had to choose between the two options of either selling toys in a department store or in supermarkets. Most candidates understood that they had to justify why they had chosen which option. However, a large number of candidates gave very detailed descriptions of the two options, which was knowledge and therefore they did not gain any marks. This was also a question where a number of candidates continued on an additional sheet. Perhaps if they had not included details descriptions of the two options, they would probably have answered the question in the space provided. Some candidates made some very valid comments, but then did not develop them to gain the analyse and evaluate marks available. Just over a quarter of the candidates gained a Level 1 mark, and nearly half of the cohort gained a Level 2 mark showing sound application of knowledge, analysis, and evaluative comments.

## SECTION B

### Question 3

In part 3 a – another multiple choice, question where two thirds of the candidates gained the mark for identifying which option insured against loss caused by fraud.

In part 3 b – on this multiple choice, question, nearly three quarters gained the mark for calculating the cost of a meal after a discount is applied.

In part 3 c – another state question where candidates had to give a way that public liability insurance would protect Stellenbosch Kitchen. As mentioned earlier, from the responses seen, a number of candidates gave a valid answer but did not relate it back to Stellenbosch Kitchen and therefore did not gain the mark available. Nearly a third of the candidates gained the mark. Again, even if the candidate mentioned Stellenbosch Kitchen, but did not put the response in context, they would not gain the mark. If Stellenbosch Kitchen appears in the question and the candidate uses the name in the response, then they are not answering the question in context.

In part 3 d – this is an outline question which is very similar to a state question where candidates must put their response in the context of the question candidates were asked why Stellenbosch Kitchen would purchase goods directly from suppliers. Nearly two thirds of the cohort did not gain a mark on this question. Again, from the responses seen

a number of candidates gave more than one reason, also number of candidates gave the correct response but it was not in context, and therefore did not gain the marks available.

In part 3 e – candidates were asked to analyse the impact of bad debts on Stellenbosch Kitchen’s suppliers of ingredients. A number of candidates misread the question and answered as if Stellenbosch Kitchen had bad debts not their suppliers. This may be why over a quarter of the candidates did not gain any marks. Those candidates that gained the marks understood that if Stellenbosch Kitchen’s suppliers had bad debts it would impact on the supply of ingredients to them, either delaying ingredients being delivered or not having any ingredients that were required for the meals. Candidates should be encouraged to develop their answers with interconnected points to move them into the higher level.

In part 3 f – again another option question where candidates had to justify which one of the two options would be more suitable, either increasing the size of the restaurant or renting new premises for delivery orders. As in question 2 many candidates described both methods giving the advantages and disadvantages. Again, there are no knowledge marks available for this type of question. Most candidates were able to gain marks on this question with only 5% of the cohort not gaining a mark. Nearly half of the cohort gained a Level 2 mark and just 15% gaining a Level 3 mark. Candidates should be encouraged to analyse and evaluate the two options to enable them to gain the higher marks. There is no right or wrong answer on this type of question, the candidates can justify either one. Candidates should also be encouraged to draw conclusions and make judgements or evaluative comments to gain the higher level marks.

## SECTION C

### Question 4

In part 4 a - candidates should be encouraged to show their workings as advised in this question, as they could gain a mark for the formula, even if the actual answer is incorrect. Also as mentioned earlier candidates need to take care when writing their figures in the box, for some candidates it is difficult for the examiner to read, for example, if they have written a 4 or 7 or 9. However, just under a third of the candidates gained the two marks available. It is worth reiterating that if the question asks for a calculation to two decimal places, if a response only has one decimal place, with the correct answer they would only get one mark, for not following what the question asked. Also, any question that is in the context of monetary value there are normally two figures after the decimal place. Again, if only one is given then only one mark would be awarded.

In part 4 b – over 40% of the cohort gained a Level 2 for this question. As previously mentioned, this is an analyse question, which is looking for application of knowledge and analysis of the impact of depreciation of the Hong Kong currency on Hanamoji's business. From some of the responses seen a number of candidates gave the opposite reason for the depreciation. Again, candidates had not fully read the question. It is important to reread the question perhaps three times to ensure that candidates answer what is being asked.

In part 4 c – It is worth pointing out to candidates that this question does carry the most marks and they should allow sufficient time to answer it, with all four of the Assessment Objectives being covered. A number of candidates only completed a few lines and therefore did not gain many of the marks available. Some candidates are using bullet points or numbered format, this will not allow them to gain the higher level marks because they may not have analysed or evaluated the points made.

Candidates were asked to evaluate why Hanamoji should take out insurance for his stall and contents. A variety of valid comments were made by candidates, such as theft, fire. However, they then failed to develop these points and justify their reasoning or give evaluative comments to enable them to gain the higher level marks. Nearly half of the candidates achieved a Level 2 mark for this question and just over a tenth of cohort not gaining a mark. Candidates should ensure that they give detailed comments about the question with some application of knowledge, analysis and evaluative comments.

Some candidates continued on additional paper, which is acceptable, but if there is no indication on the examination paper that they have done so, valuable marks could be lost. Candidates must let the examiner know that they have continued their answer, simply by adding the word 'continued', or 'contd' or something similar is acceptable and as mentioned earlier, together with which question they are continuing with.