

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this assignment.

Collating and Reporting – extract

These are extracts from candidate scripts. Note that in reality, marks for graphics are shown by the marker on the flyleaf, rather than the script itself.

Candidate A

Title – the success of Lavemill Larder’s existing marketing measures in creating customer awareness

The candidate was awarded **2/2 marks** because

- ◆ Correct headings (**1 mark**)
- ◆ At least 2 graphics (**1 mark**)

Candidate B

Title – the marketing mix of Danny’s takeaway

The candidate was awarded **1/2 marks** because

- ◆ Incorrect headings (**0 marks – introduction instead of background information**)
- ◆ Two different graphics (**1 mark**)

Candidate C

Title – the external factors of PepsiCo and its competitors

The candidate was awarded **0/2 marks** because

- ◆ Incorrect headings (**0 marks – analysis and recommendations - the ‘Introduction and’ can be ignored in the first heading**)
- ◆ Only one graphic (**0 marks**)