

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each stage of this course assessment component.

Stage 1 – project proposal

1a: Literature review (award up to 12 marks)

The candidate was awarded **11 marks** because the literature review is well written. It is very clear and concise and is communicated very clearly. It is relevant to the topic and discusses all the main themes in detail, which was to determine if statutory date codes need to be reviewed. In addition to the discussion, it is supported by evidence of reading an extensive range of current, credible, and relevant sources; and appropriate, relevant references.

1b: Research question and objectives (award up to 3 marks)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the candidate gave a valid research question: Do date codes need to be reviewed? (**1 mark**). In addition to this, the candidate provided two objectives which are valid and should help to prove or disprove the research question (**2 marks**).

1c: Research plan – explanation of techniques (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the candidate identified two appropriate research techniques: questionnaire and interview. The candidate provided a plan, which was clear with detailed explanations of the suitability of each of the research techniques to be used in the research. Overall, the plan was clear, concise, flowed logically and could be easily followed.

Total awarded for stage 1: 19/20 marks

Stage 2 – research

2a: Results – relevance and clarity (award up to 10 marks)

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because two sets of results are presented, which are relevant and communicated clearly.

Research results are presented for both the questionnaire and interview. Answers are clear, concise and easy to interpret. However, the percentages in questionnaire results do not necessarily aid understanding, but 12 questions were asked and all appear to be valid and linked to the research question.

Eight questions asked in the interview to a very credible source and all questions are valid.

2b: Results – coverage (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the results presented represent adequate coverage of the research question. The questionnaire asks questions which cover both objectives, mainly focussing on the second objective as it was given to consumers. The interview asks questions which cover both objectives and mostly linked to objective 1.

Total awarded for stage 2: 13/15 marks

Stage 3 – analysis and evaluation:

3a: Analysis (award up to 20 marks)

The candidate was awarded **15 marks** because the information in the analysis is synthesised from two pieces of research. The explanations clearly identify relevant pieces of information from the results, and relationships between them. The analysis demonstrates consideration of most aspects of the research undertaken and the way(s) in which those may be relevant to the research question and objectives. To gain more marks more coverage would have been required.

3b: Evaluation (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because a comprehensive evaluation of the research process was given. The candidate demonstrated a good understanding of how to evaluate. This was based on the strengths and/or limitations of the techniques and sources used, and/or the relevance and quality of the information gathered in relation to the topic which was covered. An exciting next step in the research process was given.

Total awarded for stage 3: 20/25 marks

Overall total for project: 52/60 marks