

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Stage 1: project proposal

The candidate was awarded **18 out of 20 marks** for this stage.

Literature review

The candidate was awarded **11 out of 12 marks** because they provided a literature review which was communicated very clearly. It was closely linked to the topic of obesity and how external factors are contributing to it. The key themes were explored in detail, supported by evidence of extensive reading and the use of current, relevant and credible sources. Appropriate referencing was also demonstrated throughout.

Research question and objectives

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they a valid research question '*How significant are external factors in contributing to obesity?*'

The candidate also provided two valid objectives which helped to prove or disprove the research question. These were: '*To explore how external factors contribute to the prevalence of obesity in our population*' and '*To determine how well the general public knows how external factors can contribute to obesity*'.

The research question and objectives were provided at 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.

Research plan: explanation of techniques

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 5 marks** because 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 these research techniques; the first being an interview with a suitable identified expert. There was one clear point of explanation which related to the interview. The second research technique was a questionnaire, where the candidate provided three clear points of explanation as to why this was a suitable method of research.

Please note: candidates must ensure that they explain rather than just state why the research methods they have identified are suitable.

Stage 2: research

The candidate was awarded **13 out of 15 marks** for this stage.

Results: relevance and clarity

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 10 marks** because they provided two sets of results, one from each method of research. Overall, these results were communicated very clearly. The interview results were very clear and easy to interpret, with the questions numbered, formatted in bold and the answer placed directly underneath. The expert and their role were clearly identified at the beginning of the interview, which was helpful. The results of the questionnaire were difficult to interpret; the candidate displayed the question asked and the number of respondents for each. However, the questions were not numbered, the results were turned into graphs and the numbers and the percentages was displayed which was unnecessary and made the results difficult to interpret.

Results: coverage

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

Stage 3: analysis and evaluation

The candidate was awarded **20 out of 25 marks** for this stage.

Analysis

The candidate was awarded **16 out of 20 marks** because they provided an analysis which was effectively synthesised from at least two pieces of research. The points of analysis were very good and clearly linked to results of the research as well as the relationship between these results in relation to the context of the research question and objectives that had been identified.

The candidate was also able to develop some points of analysis, adding further depth to their responses. Overall, this would be considered a very good attempt at analysis.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 5 marks** because they gave an evaluation. However, although it was lengthy and many of the paragraphs were not evaluative or linked to the research process, it was felt that there were only three valid evaluations given. The candidate made one valid recommendation for further study *'it would be interesting to research further into this external factor and to investigate if it could be prevented.'*

The project achieved an overall total of **51 out of 60 marks**.

Candidate 2

Stage 1: project proposal

The candidate was awarded **19 out of 20 marks** for this stage.

Literature review

The candidate was awarded **12 out of 12 marks**. This was an excellent literature review which was clearly written with good flow, communicated very clearly and was relevant to the topic of convenience versus consequence. The key themes were discussed in depth, which demonstrated evidence of extensive reading and the use of current and credible sources, which were referenced correctly.

Research question and objectives

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they gave a valid research question: *'What are the long term health effects of frequent takeaway consumption?'*

The candidate only provided one valid objective which helped to prove or disprove the research question: *'To assess consumer awareness of the health impacts associated with takeaway food consumption'*. The second objective was not valid as it was too vague.

Research plan: explanation of techniques

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 5 marks** because they provided a plan which gave five clear points explaining why they had chosen the specific methods of research for their project and the suitability of these research techniques. The first research technique was a questionnaire, and the candidate gave four clear points explaining why this was a suitable research method. The second piece of research selected was an interview with a suitable identified expert. There were also four clear points of explanation which related to the interview. This meant that the candidate was able to reach the maximum mark allocation for this section.

Please note: there are a maximum of three marks awarded for points of explanations for each research technique in the research plan.

Stage 2: research

The candidate was awarded **13 out of 15 marks** for this stage.

Results: relevance and clarity

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 10 marks** because they provided two sets of results; one from each method of research. Overall, these results were communicated very clearly. The results of the questionnaire were difficult to interpret. The candidate displayed the question asked, which was clearly numbered. However, the results were turned into graphs and the numbers and the percentages were displayed which is not necessary and made it difficult to interpret. The interview results were very clear and easy to interpret, with the questions numbered, formatted in bold and the answer placed directly underneath.

Results: coverage

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

Stage 3: analysis and evaluation

The candidate was awarded **24 out of 25 marks** for this stage.

Analysis

The candidate was awarded **20 out of 20 marks** because they provided an analysis which was effectively synthesised from at least two pieces of research. The points of analysis were very good and clearly linked to results of the research as well as the

relationship between these results in relation to the context of the research question and objectives which were identified.

The candidate was also able to develop some points of analysis, adding further depth to their responses. Overall, an excellent attempt at analysis.

Evaluation

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 5 marks** because they gave an evaluation that had valid points linked to the research process. The candidate made one valid recommendation for further study *'to consider exploring whether alternative convenient meal options (e.g., meal kits., healthier premade meals) can reduce takeaway consumption'*.

The project achieved an overall total of **56 out of 60 marks**.