

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage the project.

Stage 1: Project proposal

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

The candidate was awarded **11 marks** because they provided a literature review which was communicated very clearly, is relevant to the topic of nutrition and how important it is for optimum performance in adolescent athletes. The literature review discussed the main themes in detail, and provided evidence of extensive reading, which was supported by evidence of a varied range of current and credible sources, these were also referenced correctly.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they gave a valid research question: 'How Important is nutrition for optimum performance and recovery in adolescent athletes?'

The candidate also provided two valid objectives which helped to prove or disprove the research question. These were: To find out how much adolescents know about the impact nutrition has on their athletic performance and recovery. To find out a sport nutritionist's view on the impact nutrition has on athlete's overall performance and recovery.

The research question and objectives were provided on the top of the contents page, these should be provided after the literature review, however, the marks were awarded because they had made their research question and objectives clear within the body of the project.

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

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they identified two appropriate research techniques which were a questionnaire and an Interview with an identified expert. They provided a plan which gave four clear points of explanation as to why they had chosen the specific methods of research for their project and the suitability of both those research techniques.

Please note: candidates must ensure that they explain rather than just state why the research method is good.

Total awarded for stage 1: 18 out of 20 marks.

Stage 2: Research

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

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because they provided two sets of results, one from each method of research, these were communicated overall very clearly. The interview results were very clear and easy to interpret with the question and the answer clearly displayed together. The results of the questionnaire were a little less easy to interpret, the questions were clearly shown and the results from the respondents were turned into graphs, some of the graphs had writing in them which wasn't clear and the results were converted into % which is not necessary.

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

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because they presented a set of results from both the interview and the questionnaire which represented comprehensive coverage of the research question, taking into consideration the objectives and this therefore should allow for analysis to be carried out.

Total awarded for stage 2: 13 out of 15 marks.

Stage 3: Analysis and Evaluation

3(a): Analysis (award up to 20 marks)

The candidate was awarded **13 marks** because they provided analysis which was synthesised from at least two pieces of research. The explanations which have been given clearly identify relevant pieces of information from the results and the relationships between them in relation to the context of the research question and the objectives which were identified. This candidate also gave some analysis points which were developed from the original point.

3(b): Evaluation (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they gave an evaluation with two clear points which were evaluative and made judgements on their research process. The candidate made one valid recommendation for further research in relation to the research question.

Total awarded for stage 3: 16 out of 25 marks.

Overall total for project 47 out of 60 marks.

Candidate 2

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each stage of the project.

Stage 1: Project proposal

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

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because they provided a literature review which was communicated very clearly, is relevant to the topic of 'Why online food shopping could be the new normal'. The literature review discussed the main themes mostly in detail, and provided evidence of a wide range of reading, this was backed up by providing a varied range of current and credible sources, these were also referenced correctly.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the candidate gave a valid research question: 'Are the changing trends in grocery shopping, changing customers shopping habits?'

The candidate also provided two valid objectives which helped to prove or disprove the research question. These were: 'Find out about the changing trends in grocery shopping' and 'Establish the reasons why consumers choose their method of shopping (online or in store)'.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because they identified two appropriate research techniques which were a questionnaire and an interview with an identified expert. They provided a plan which gave three clear points of explanation as to why they had chosen the specific methods of research for their project and the suitability of both those research techniques. Candidates must be careful in this section and ensure that they explain rather than just state why the research method is good.

Total awarded for stage 1: 16 out of 20 marks.

Stage 2: Research

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

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** because they provided two sets of results, one from each method of research, these were communicated overall very clearly. The interview results were very clear and easy to interpret with the question and the answer clearly displayed together. The results of the questionnaire were a little less easy to interpret, they were presented in graphs and information was given underneath the graph which was in /122 and % it was felt that this was confusing as the graphs were clear and concise.

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

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they presented a set of results from both the interview and the questionnaire which represented adequate coverage of the research question, however it was felt that the research was lacking in coverage with regards to one of the objectives which therefore restricted the analysis which could be carried out.

Total awarded for stage 2: 13 out of 15 marks.

Stage 3: Analysis and Evaluation**3(a): Analysis (award up to 20 marks)**

The candidate was awarded **13 marks** because they provided analysis which was synthesised from at least two pieces of research. The explanations which have been given clearly identify relevant pieces of information from the results and the relationships between them in relation to the context of the research question and the objectives which were identified. This candidate also gave some analysis points which were developed from the original point.

3(b): Evaluation (award up to 5 marks)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because the candidate gave an evaluation with three clear points which were evaluative and made judgements on their research process. The candidate made no valid recommendation for further research in relation to the research question.

Total awarded for stage 3: 16 out of 25 marks.

Overall total for project: 45 out of 60 marks.