

# AGRICULTURE

## SUBJECT 9159

### PAPER 4

#### General Comments

There was a marked improvement in the way projects are done by most centres. Well established centres that have been offering the subject since its inception have been doing quite well. The quality of projects from such centres is quite distinct from those centres that have joined recently. Centres are advised to contact the subject manager and get the recently produced project assessment guide so that candidates are guided accordingly.

#### Comments for Specific areas

- a) **Selection of topics:** There is need for proper guidance of candidates in selection of appropriate research areas. More often candidates lose marks when they come up with topics that are not concise and focused. Generally centres have been doing survey projects. These do not score high marks due to the fact that candidates face problems in the research method and data collection. It is advised that centres guide their candidates to chose problems that involve experimentation for better marks.
- e) **Hypothesis**  
Candidates are losing marks for not coming up with their stand point about the outcome of project in relation to what they have set out to achieve. Good candidates are stating their null and alternative hypothesis quite well.
- f) **Literature Review:** Good centres are having their candidates review related literature to their areas of investigation. However most candidates are losing marks for not reviewing literature or for merely quoting authors whilst citing literature that is not relevant to their research. Centres have to follow the guidelines spelt out in the project guide in terms of the length of the literature review so that candidates are not disadvantaged.
- g) **Methodology:** Candidates are losing a lot of marks for not coming up with clear strategies of gathering information. No meaningful research designs are being produced by candidates resulting in loss of marks by most of them.
- f) **Data Collection:** Candidates are losing marks for not clearly showing how data was collected and also the collected data.
- g) **Data Analysis:** Candidates are not showing how they are going to analyse the collected data and thus lose marks unnecessarily. Statistical analysis of data lacking for the majority of candidates.

b) **Abstract:** Where as the abstract is supposed to give a brief overview of the problem and its setting; method; results and the outcome, most centres have candidates that lose marks for failing to produce a meaningful abstract. More often most candidates write a five or six sentence paragraph which does not highlight what transpired.

c) **Aims / Research Questions / Objectives.**  
Most candidates are failing to produce a broad meaningful aim of the project. Some candidates write paragraphs. The aims is supposed to be broad and general and in line with the topic of the project.

Research questions are supposed to guide the candidates in data collection as well as setting of objectives. Some questions are too general and pose problems for candidates in terms of finding answers to them. Objectives by most candidates were not achievable, measurable and too broad. Centres are advised to guide their candidates in the formulation of these objectives.

d) **Limitations / Delimitations**  
Most candidates do not write or capture the problems they encountered when they undertook their research work. In some cases candidates relate limitations to problems encountered by their communities during production. Under delimitations the candidates fail to highlight the parameters governing where the project was done that could have influenced the results.

h) **Results :** Candidates are losing marks for inflating figures when they put down their results. This has resulted in yields of maize such as 30-40t/ha being achieved from experimental plots which is unrealistic. Results collected should be meaningful and tabulated.

i) **Results analysis / Discussion**  
Candidates are losing marks for failing to analyse results or data collected in relationship with set objectives and also relating these results to the reviewed literature. Statistical analysis of data is lacking for the majority of candidates. At this level candidates are expected to be analytical and give reasoned judgement.

j) **Summary /Conclusion**  
Centres should guide candidates to write brief summaries that captures every aspect of the project and not necessarily rewriting the whole project.

k) **Recommendations:**

Candidates are writing general recommendations and in some cases not related to the research findings. Recommendations for further research are generally lacking.

l) **Referencing**

This is still a major problem for most candidates as cited authors are not written properly in alphabetical order. Good candidates are doing well in this area.