



**General Certificate of Secondary Education
June 2011**

**Home Economics: 45852
Food and Nutrition**

(Specification 4585)

Unit 2: Food and Nutrition in Practice

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on **the Examination** are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Principal Moderator's Report

Much of the controlled assessment component submitted by centres was of a very high standard and carefully marked and annotated by teachers in line with the AQA assessment criteria. Much credit is due to the hard work of the teachers involved in the delivery and marking of this new and sometimes perplexing 'coursework' or controlled assessment. The first year of a new specification is always fraught with uncertainties but a sound basis has been established from which to progress in future years. Most centres seem to have accessed the information available on the AQA website in the form of the Coursework Guidelines and the Guidelines for the Research Task and the Individual Investigation. Where centres had used these Guidelines, candidates were in a better position to score high marks, as the guidelines closely follow the assessment objectives in the Specification.

Many centres presented a range of investigations, with candidates producing very individual work. There were some similar studies, particularly Research Tasks where candidates had all investigated the same task, however these cases were very rare. The most original work was seen in centres where candidates had spent time researching and refining their chosen solution.

General Comments.

- Presentation: There was considerable variation in the standard of presentation, with some excellent work, making good use of ICT, photos, graphs, charts etc. A few centres submitted investigations that were poorly presented and lacking page numbering, headings, a bibliography and a title page. Some candidates did not write out the task title in full on the front cover.
- Teacher annotation: Some teachers made very detailed comments and annotation on scripts, while others made very little, making it hard for moderators to see where marks had been awarded. Some centres failed to give a breakdown of the marks awarded, which created difficulties when advising centres where overmarking occurred.
- Photographic evidence of the finished practical work was lacking in several centres. Where there is no evidence of practical work being carried out a mark of zero will be given by the moderator (see page 35 of the specification).

- Assessment Objectives (AO):

AO 1.1 The main problem was a lack of justification by many candidates for the issues identified.

AO 1.2 Insufficient research was carried out by some candidates, particularly for the Individual Investigation.

AO 2.1 Many candidates provided no statement of aims which reduce the mark available.

AO 2.2 Evidence of research was lacking in poorer investigations with little attempt at analysis of the information collected.

AO 2.3 Although most candidates gave reasons for choice of practical work, some did not produce a statement of aims which again prohibited marks being awarded in the top band.

AO 2.4 Timeplans: Some candidates did not produce timeplans, just recipes and methods. Timeplans should show a breakdown or order of work for the tasks to be completed in the time allocation. Where possible this should include dovetailing of processes for more than one dish and the time allowed for each process. It should indicate the methods used, e.g. bake in oven, the oven temperature and the time taken to cook. Time should also be set aside for washing up and sensory testing.

AO 2.5 Many candidates had been marked in the top band when they had not produced evidence of 6-8 hours work for the Individual Investigation and 1-2 hours for the Research Task. Some candidates produced the same dish for both the Individual Investigation and the Research Task. Work can only be credited once, usually for the Research Task. Some candidates were given high marks for simple dishes or dishes that were poorly made and presented. To be marked in the top band, candidates must demonstrate a wide range of skills to a high standard.

AO 3.1 Ongoing evaluations of research and practical work improves the mark in AO 3.1.

AO 3.2 To be marked in the top band, candidates must refer to each of the issues identified in the task analysis.

Research Task

The more popular topics for the Research Task were Task 1 (Low Sugar), Task 2 (Fruit and Vegetables) and Task 5 (Student Meals), with the least popular being Task 6 (Food Additives). Most tasks were well done, apart from that on low sugar snack foods where some candidates made savoury items without any reference to the sugar content of the dishes made (see AO 3 in the Guidelines for Research Task).

The Research Task should take a minimum of 6 hours class time to complete, with a maximum of 8 hours. Of this time, it is recommended that 2-3 hours is spent on identifying issues and questions, and assembling relevant information (AO1.2).

Task analysis (AO 2.1) should follow the completion of the research phase, with a list of clear aims for the rest of the investigation.

Analysing information (AO2.2) should cover analysis of questionnaires, dietary diaries, surveys etc and should be used to identify a clear course of action for AO2.3. This together with planning the practical work for AO2.4 should occupy approximately 2 hours of class time for most candidates.

Candidates should plan between 1 and 2 hours of practical work for the Research task, depending on the nature of the task. Practical work should demonstrate as wide a range of skills as possible in the allocated time.

Evaluation should be ongoing throughout the investigation, with candidates reviewing their progress in light of their findings. These evaluations, together with sensory and nutritional analysis, costings etc, are credited in AO 3.1.

Overall evaluations (AO 3.2) should reflect on the whole of the investigation, and candidates should be allowed sufficient time to make reference to the issues identified and draw conclusions on the effectiveness of the outcomes of their investigation.

The main weaknesses observed by moderators in the Research Tasks were insufficient time spent on AO 1.2 (Assemble relevant information), AO 2.1 where many candidates scored very low marks through failure to produce a list of aims, and in AO 2.4 and AO 2.5 where insufficient practical work had been planned and carried out. Some candidates were marked in the top band when they had made very simple dishes which did not represent two hours work of the required standard: smoothies, wraps, fruit salad and buns were some examples.

Individual Investigation

The more popular Topics for the Individual Investigation were Task 1 (School Meals), Task 2 (Health Problems), Task 5 (Elderly) and Task 6 (Non-meat eaters). The least popular Individual Investigation topic was Task 3 (Starchy Foods).

It is recommended that 18 hours of class time should be spent on the Individual Investigation, and that this larger task is completed in Year 11 when candidates have gained more depth of knowledge and understanding of the subject content. For this task, candidates should be advised to spend approximately 6 hours of class time assembling relevant information from a wide range of primary and secondary sources. Details of appropriate research for each investigation can be found in the 'Guidelines for the Individual Investigation'. Candidates should be encouraged to study as wide a range of sources as possible and synthesise the information, rather than copying directly from books and websites. When primary research, such as questionnaires, surveys, dietary diaries etc. are carried out, correct methodology should be employed. For example, questionnaires require an introduction, the target group should be identified and the size of the sample stated. It might also be helpful to carry out a pilot questionnaire before conducting the final one.

Once the research has been collected, candidates need to show that they have fully explored the area of content identified in AO1.1, by carrying out a task analysis of what they intend to investigate. They should then produce a list of aims based on their research findings. For example: 'from my research I have found out the DRVs for fibre and good sources of fibre in the diet. For my practical work I will plan dishes that are high in fibre content.' Analysis of the information collected should include presenting the results of questionnaires etc. in the form of charts or graphs, and written evaluation of the results. This, together with planning the practical work, should take most candidates approximately 4 hours of class time.

Practical work should be carried out in normal lesson time and occupy between 6-8 hours, with top band candidates demonstrating a wide range of practical skills and dovetailing of more than one recipe per session. Sensory analysis should be carried out in school for at least one practical session, with description of the tasting panel and methodology outlined in AO2.4. Sensory and nutritional analysis is marked in AO3.1. Good nutritional analysis includes comments from the candidates on the nutritional adequacy of the dishes analysed and not just printouts from a computer programme.

The main areas for improvement for the Individual Investigations are as follows:

AO 1.1 Lack of justification for the issues identified prevented many candidates from scoring marks in the top band.

AO 1.2 Many candidates did not spend sufficient time on research with some only producing similar amounts to that of the Research Task. Candidates can not be awarded marks

above 8 where they have only produced a questionnaire and notes from a secondary source.

AO 2.1 Candidates could improve their mark by producing a list of aims.

AO 2.2 A lack of research in AO1.2 limits the interpretation and evaluation of the information collected, and restricts the mark that can be awarded for analysis of information.

AO 2.3 Although most candidates gave reasons for their choice of practical work, some did not include a clear statement of aims which linked to the research analysis.

AO 2.4 Planning did not always cover all aspects of the task, particularly where timeplans were not included.

AO 2.5 In order to be marked in the top band candidates must demonstrate a high level of skill and competence, and produce practical work which represents 6-8 hours of class time. Some candidates were given high marks for simple dishes or in some cases, dishes that were poorly cooked and finished.

AO 3.1 Ongoing evaluations of research and practical work can be credited in AO3.1.

AO 3.2 To be marked in the top band candidates must refer to each of the issues identified in the task analysis.

Despite these observations, the Individual Investigations were on the whole very well done, and some excellent studies were seen at the top end. The first examination of the Controlled Assessment has proved to be very successful, with candidate achievement commensurate with that of previous years.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.