

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for these candidates achieved the following marks for each question in the question paper.

Candidate 1 – 22/30 marks

Question 1a

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they correctly described two changes that could be made to the recipe – changing butter to polyunsaturated margarine and removing the salt. They accurately explained how each change would meet different pieces of current dietary advice

Question 1b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained that poaching does not use any oils, unlike frying, so would reduce the fat content.

Question 1c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly identified grated cheese as a suitable garnish.

Question 1d

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they correctly described the storage of tuna – remove from tin and place in a sealed container in the fridge – and explained that this would prevent the metal from contaminating the tuna. The additional explanation of keeping it in the fridge to prevent it going off would also have been awarded a mark if the first explanation had not been given. They were not awarded a mark for the response on the storage of herbs because they did not state that they had to be in a sealed jar/container. No mark was awarded for the explanation because it linked to an incorrect/incomplete fact.

Question 2a

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they correctly explained two benefits of buying local foods.

Benefit 1 was awarded a mark because they explained how it benefited local farmers by giving them money. Benefit 2 was also awarded a mark because they explained how reducing food miles meant foods did not travel far so reducing carbon emissions.

Benefit 3 was not awarded a mark because there was no explanation or evidence about why there would be less packaging required.

Question 2b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they made one correct evaluative comment.

They correctly stated a fact linked to chopped chives (they would add a green colour) and a consequence (would improve the appearance) but they made no judgement so no mark was awarded here.

They then correctly stated a fact linked to Worcestershire sauce (would give a tangy flavour), made a judgement (overall improving the dish) with the consequence that the bland flavour would be improved so a mark was awarded here.

Finally, they stated two incorrect facts linked to mustard (would give a bitter taste and give yellow colour). No marks were awarded for these.

Question 2c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly described that honey would give a dish a sweet flavour. The response linked to oats was incorrect because oats would not give a crunchy texture.

Question 2d

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they correctly described two rules to be used when weighing and measuring sugar. Although they described two correct rules linked to the use of scales, only 1 mark was available for each piece of equipment.

Question 3a

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the cost of all 5 ingredients had been correctly calculated.

Question 3b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the total cost had been correctly calculated.

Question 3c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the cost of one portion had been correctly calculated.

Question 3d

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they described two reasons why flour is sieved but did not explain either of their responses.

Question 3e

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained one safety factor.

Safety factor 1 correctly explained why oven gloves should be used – to prevent burns when taking apple sponge in and out of the oven.

Their answer for safety factor 2 contained two statements but both lacked an explanation as to how they would prevent cuts so no mark was awarded.

Candidate 2 – 22/30 marks

Question 1a

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they correctly described changing butter to polyunsaturated margarine and explained that it would reduce the saturated fat in the recipe.

Change 2 was incorrect because the rice should have been changed to brown rice, not wholemeal – candidates must use correct terminology in order to be awarded marks. Because the change was incorrect, no mark could be awarded for the explanation.

Question 1b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained that the nutrients would leach into the liquid which is served as a sauce.

Question 1c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly named finely chopped parsley as a suitable garnish.

Question 1d

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because they correctly described the storage of the ingredients and explained why each method was suitable. They correctly described that tuna should be out of the tin, resealed in a container and placed in the fridge. They also explained that this would avoid the aluminium contaminating the tuna. They would not have been awarded a mark for explaining that putting it in the fridge would keep it fresh because this is too vague and does not explain how refrigeration would keep the tuna fresh.

They correctly described how the herbs must be resealed and placed back in the cupboard and explained that this would mean that they stayed dry, and did not go mouldy and musty.

Question 2a

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained one benefit of buying local foods.

Benefit 1 was awarded a mark because they explained how reduced food miles meant that food was fresher on arrival.

Benefit 2 was not awarded a mark because it did not explain how it helped keep local farmers in business. Benefit 3 was also not awarded a mark because it did not explain the benefit of knowing where the food came from.

Question 2b

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they made two correct evaluative comments.

They correctly stated a fact linked to chopped chives (they are very colourful), made a judgement (would be a good idea) with the consequence that the mash would have a better appearance and this was awarded a mark.

They then correctly stated a fact linked to Worcestershire sauce (that it is very flavoursome), made a judgement (that it would be a good idea) with the consequence that it would give the plain mash a better taste and this was also awarded a mark.

Finally, they stated an incorrect fact linked to mustard and this was not awarded a mark.

Question 2c

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they did not correctly describe the use of oats or honey in a savoury dish. There is no guarantee that the use of oats would give a good texture to a dish and the response linked to honey was too vague.

Question 2d

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they correctly described two rules to be followed when weighing or measuring sugar – that the spoon should be levelled and that the scales should be set to zero before using.

Question 3a

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the cost of all five ingredients had been correctly calculated.

Question 3b

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the total cost had been correctly calculated.

Question 3c

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because the cost of one portion had been correctly calculated.

Question 3d

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained that flour should be sieved to prevent it sticking together in a chunk so that it would all be mixed in properly.

Question 3e

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because they correctly explained one safety factor. Safety factor 1 explained how holding the knife correctly while walking would ensure no harm was done to anyone.

Safety factor 2 gave two statements but did not explain either of them, so no mark was awarded.