### C. COMPLIANCE WITH SYLLABUS GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assignment details submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assignments adhered to specified length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assignments adhered to required format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mark Schemes conformed to syllabus guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assignments marked as specified in syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON CANDIDATES’ SUBMISSIONS

Candidates have:

1. Demonstrated adequate knowledge of the content and objectives assessed
2. Demonstrated competence in the skills assessed
3. Submitted neat and legible research papers
4. Included all the essential features of good presentation in the research papers
5. Demonstrated understanding of the issues related to the topics chosen
6. Stated conclusions that were coherent and relevant
7. Showed sufficient evidence of their own work in the research paper

The overall quality of candidates’ submissions was:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Candidates’ performance could have been improved by:

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

### E. QUALITY OF TEACHER’S MARKING

The teacher’s marking of the sample was:

- Acceptable
- Severe
- Lenient
- Inconsistent