

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:

Literature review (award up to 12 marks)

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because the literature review is well written and focuses clearly on the topic of sugar tax. The main issues surrounding the topic have been covered but they have not been fully discussed, lots of facts and figures were given without discussion. There is evidence of reading a range of current and credible sources.

Research question and objectives (award up to 3 marks)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the candidate gave a valid research question. The research question was provided on the front page so although the candidate did not state the question in the correct place they were still awarded the mark because they had made a research question clear. The best place for the question is to be clearly stated with a heading at the top of a new page before the research plan. They did not provide any objectives.

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

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the candidate identified two appropriate research techniques: sensory test and questionnaire, for carrying out the research. They 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: 16/20

Stage 2 research:

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

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because two sets of results are presented.

- ◆ Sensory testing – it was felt as there was no key the results were not easy to interpret, although all answers were shown it was felt that some of the results were not relevant and did not aid clarity.
- ◆ Questionnaire – all responses have been shown from the questionnaire and most can be interpreted easily, however, the candidate changes from numbers to percentages in the responses and this becomes confusing for interpretation of the results.

Results: coverage (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because it was felt that the results presented demonstrate an understanding of the research questions, however it was felt that the questionnaire could have had more focussed questions, which clearly linked to the research question and objectives. Not sure how the sensory testing allows for the analysis to take place and to get sufficient relevant information.

Total awarded for stage 2: research 7/15

Stage 3 analysis and evaluation:

Analysis (award up to 20 marks)

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** because they made an attempt at analysis. The explanations they have given identify relevant pieces of information from the results, and the relationships between them. The candidate has given some basic consideration to some aspects of the research undertaken and the ways in which those may be relevant to the research question and objectives.

Evaluation (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they provided some valid points of evaluation that related to the research process undertaken, some of the points given were repetitive and too generic in places. The candidate did not provide any valid recommendation for further study.

Total awarded for stage 3: analysis and evaluation 10/25

Overall total for project 33/60