

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for these candidates has achieved the following marks for each section of the assignment.

Candidate 1

Total marks awarded – 28/30

Research methods (gathering techniques 1 and 2)	4
Reference to/use of processed information	6
Knowledge and understanding	6
Analysing information	8
Conclusions	2
Communicating information	2

Study of the Kippford to Sandyhills Coastal Path

Page 1

The first Knowledge and Understanding (KU) mark is awarded at 'National Scenic Awards' for relevant knowledge introducing us to the study (**1 mark**), and the second is awarded at 'health benefits' for further development of this (**1 mark**). A third KU mark is awarded for the link of visitor numbers to economic benefit and multiplier effect (**1 mark**). There is no further credit for this paragraph as income has already been credited and there is not enough for a further mark.

A fourth KU mark is awarded at 'surface erosion and over-growth' for identifying a list of management issues (**1 mark**). A further KU mark is awarded at 'surface run-off' for identification and explanation of a strategy (**1 mark**) and a further KU mark is awarded at 'draining side' for providing a further strategy and explanation (**1 mark**). The candidate has now reached the maximum number of 6 marks available for KU however, further marks could have been awarded as follows.

A KU mark could have been awarded at 'its natural course' for a strategy and explanation (**1 mark**). A further KU mark could have been awarded at 'it was more expensive' for two limited evaluations of the management strategy (**1 mark**). A KU mark could have been awarded at 'exceeds evaporation' because the soil type is relevant to this study (**1 mark**).

Page 2

No marks are awarded for the diagram; 'poorly drained' has already been credited and the idea of the only plant supported being juncus is contradicted later in the page when the use of gorse is explained.

A first KU mark on this page could have been awarded at 'on the path' for a management strategy and explanation (**1 mark**). A further KU could have been awarded at 'under close supervision' for two limited evaluations of the strategies (**1 mark**).

A KU mark could have been awarded at 'to the soil' (there are three limited points here however, water absorption has already been credited) **(1 mark)**. A KU mark could have been awarded at 'steep gradients' for two strategies with no explanation **(1 mark)**. An 'R' (for repeat) is placed at 'expensive' as this has already been credited on page 1, and another KU mark could have been awarded at 'difficult to build' for two evaluations of this technique **(1 mark)**. A carat is placed at 'excess erosion' as there is not quite enough here for a developed point.

Method 1: A carat is placed at 'eroded the most/least' as there is not enough detail here for a mark. A first T1 (Gathering Technique 1) mark is awarded at 'to make correlations' for a limited description of the method and limited explanation of the first technique **(1 mark)**.

Page 3

A second T1 mark is awarded at 'so few measurements' for an evaluation of the reliability of this method **(1 mark)**.

Method 2: A T2 (Gathering Technique 2) mark is awarded at 'was first-hand' for a limited description of the technique and a limited evaluation of a questionnaire **(1 mark)**. A second T2 mark was awarded at 'peak summer season' for a developed evaluation of this technique **(1 mark)**. Although the candidate goes on to say more, there is no added value to the evaluation.

Analysis 1: The first PI (reference to/use of processed information) mark is awarded at 'good condition' as the candidate has identified a pattern and given data/evidence from the PI sheets to back this up **(1 mark)**. The first AN (analysing information) mark is awarded at 'well maintained' as the candidate has given an explanation for the data above **(1 mark)**. A further PI mark is awarded at 'to say it is not' for a comparison of two groups' opinions **(1 mark)**. A KU mark could have been awarded at 'mountain bikers' for background information on the area and its usage **(1 mark)**. A further AN mark is awarded at 'boggy underfoot' for linking usage of the path with the impact of mountain bikers **(1 mark)**. Another AN mark is awarded at 'two path users' for further developing the idea of conflict in the area **(1 mark)**.

Page 4

Analysis 2: An AN mark is awarded at 'people of different capabilities' for the explanation of lower usage on this route **(1 mark)**.

An 'R' is placed at 'person's physical ability' as this is a reversal of the point above. An AN mark is awarded at 'bins around and about' for explanation of the litter issue **(1 mark)**.

No mark is awarded for the final sentence because there is the basis of a point here, but it is not expressed clearly enough.

Analysis 3: A PI mark is awarded at 'site 8 at 36cm' for identifying a comparison and backing this up with evidence from the PI sheet **(1 mark)**. A further PI mark is awarded at 'down 20cm' for a comparison (of depth cross section), again

backed up with evidence **(1 mark)**. An AN mark is awarded at 'being waterlogged' for analysis of the erosion at site 8 **(1 mark)**, and a further AN mark is given at 'the path is further eroded' for an explanation of the cross-sectional difference **(1 mark)**. An AN mark is awarded at 'scars the land' as the candidate has explained here how further erosion takes place at this site (the candidate has given two limited points here about braiding and the impact on the landscape) **(1 mark)**. The candidate has now reached the maximum of eight marks for analysis however further marks could have been awarded as follows.

Page 5

Analysis 3 continued: An AN mark could have been awarded at 'car-parks nearby' for analysis of why the path is not maintained at this point **(1 mark)**. No marks are awarded for the next depth figures (22/20cm) as no value was added to the numbers taken from the PI sheets. An AN mark could have been awarded at 'that section of the path' for analysis of why the erosion was greater at sites 11/12 due to the beach location linking to summer season **(1 mark)**. An AN mark could have been awarded at 'continually worn away' as the candidate has linked gradient to erosion **(1 mark)**. A carat was placed at '4cm deep' as there is no trend or comparison here.

Analysis 4: An AN mark could have been awarded at 'isn't too challenging' (this initially reads as KU, however by reading on it is clear that the candidate is providing this as an explanation for data later in the sentence) **(1 mark)**. A PI mark is awarded at 'down 10cm' because the candidate has extracted two linked pieces of data from their graphs **(1 mark)**. An AN mark could have been awarded at 'causing more erosion' as the candidate has linked erosion to altitude **(1 mark)**. There are no marks for the next sentence as it is largely a repeat and the candidate has already been credited for visitors in summer and the effect of wind. 'Drier' is the only new information here.

Page 6

A final PI mark is awarded at 'site 10 is 2cm' for the comparison of the least eroded areas, with data to evidence this **(1 mark)**. An 'R' was placed at the end of the next sentence as this has already been credited and another 'R' was placed at 'coming in to Portling'.

Conclusion: A Con (conclusions) mark is awarded at 'car park' for summarising the impact of popularity and maintenance access **(1 mark)**. A second Con mark is awarded at 'gradient' for the main causes of erosion **(1 mark)**.

Two marks were awarded for communicating information **(2 marks)**; the report is well structured and uses appropriate terminology for this topic.