

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Law and Order — Topic A: Understanding the criminal justice system

Question 10

‘Some issues facing the criminal justice system are of more concern than others.’

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland and any other comparator country/ countries you have studied. (30)

The candidate was awarded **19 out of 30 marks** because they achieved the following marks in each assessable element:

Analysis

This response was awarded **5 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The response analyses relevant aspects of policing as they relate to the question and includes relevant supporting evidence from the UK and comparator countries, Ireland, France and the USA. However, the answer lacks a full understanding of the question. For example, across the response, analysis is too focused on policing and does not adequately analyse other aspects of the question.

Comparison

This response was awarded **4 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK, Ireland, USA and France. There is information about Ireland’s police force and France’s stop and search policy. These international comparators are supported by relevant and contemporary evidence. However, comparisons lack qualitative comment on the extent of similarity or differences to the UK.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **5 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes reasoned points of evaluation related to the question and these are used to support the candidate’s overall judgement. Judgements are made, for example, that ‘in France, recent studies show that a black or Arab

person is 20x more likely...this shocking information further shows ...'. However, there are no alternative judgements as to issues, other than policing.

Synthesising information to structure and sustain lines of argument

This response was awarded **5 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The response has a line of argument, supported by detailed reasons and evidence. The overall conclusion follows from the points made throughout. However, the candidate does not include a response to at least one relevant counter-argument, without mentioning alternative factors.

Overall, this response was awarded **19 out of 30 marks**.

This essay has relevant evidence that backs up their line of argument. However, the reliance on the issue of policing holds it back from scoring further marks.

Candidate 2

Law and Order — Topic B: Understanding criminal behaviour

Question 12

‘Physiological theories of crime are the best way to explain criminality’

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland and any other comparator country/ countries you have studied. (30)

The candidate was awarded **30 out of 30 marks** because they achieved the following marks in each assessable element:

Analysis

This response was awarded **8 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate’s response includes detailed points of analysis throughout and this analysis is integrated with points about a range of international comparators such as Singapore and USA. Coverage includes discussion on the physiological theories of crime, referencing information from Lombroso, James Fallon and Antii Latvala. The candidate also has extensive analysis of sociological and psychological theories with examples from Becker and Bowlby. The response clearly understands the complexities of the set question and supports a convincing line of argument.

Comparison

This response was awarded **6 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK and a range of international countries to formulate their overall argument. There is information about Singapore, USA, Sweden and New Zealand. These international comparators are integrated into each paragraph and form a key part of the candidate’s line of argument throughout. The candidate clearly compares by using phrases such as ‘unlike Singapore but similar to the UK’.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **8 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes reason points of evaluation throughout the response, and these are well-evidenced. Judgements are made, for example, ‘this demonstrates that...’ and ‘demonstrating the ability of sociological theories to best explain...’ The candidate gives valid reasons for discounting physiology as the main reason to explain criminality and gives alternative reasons, such as sociological, to clearly support their overall conclusion.

Synthesising information to structure and sustain lines of argument

This response was awarded **8 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate's line of argument integrates points of analysis and evaluation throughout which they use to support their overall judgement. The overall conclusion gives some credibility to physiology but provides convincing explanations as to why sociological theories are the most important theory to explain criminality.

Overall, this response was awarded 30 out of 30 marks.

This is an example of a candidate who clearly understands the question and is able integrate analytical comments to evaluative comments in-depth, giving evidence from international countries to support their overall judgement.

Candidate 3

Political Issues —Topic A: Power and influence

Question 2

‘Some theories better explain contemporary voting behaviour than others.’

Discuss, with reference to the UK/Scotland and any other comparator country/ countries you have studied. (30)

The candidate was awarded **29 out of 30 marks** because they achieved the following marks in each assessable element:

Analysis

This response was awarded **7 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate’s response includes detailed points of analysis throughout their answer which show an in-depth understanding of the question. The sociological model, rational choice model and party identification model are all discussed in detail, as well as specific factors such as age and ethnicity. Exemplification is of a very high standard throughout and international comparison is integrated throughout the response. However, the candidate does not integrate the ideas of others with their own and is thus prevented from full marks in this section.

Comparison

This response was awarded **6 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

There is detailed international comparison throughout the response. Low-income workers in the UK are compared to those in the US and the rise of populist beliefs surrounding immigration is explained in the UK and compared to Italy. The charisma of Clegg is compared to that of Trump, and further compared to Bolsonaro. The rise of the White Lives Matter movement, and how it links to ethnicity as a factor affecting voting behaviour, is also compared to the Windrush scandal in the UK. Points of comparison are integrated throughout the response and form a key part of the line of argument.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **8 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes high quality points of evaluation throughout their response. Judgements are well thought out and display a clear understanding of the issue, for example, ‘This displays that despite rational choice model... having a prominent influence... the sociological factors still are embedded in....’ There is reasoned evaluation and judgements on a variety of different arguments and the candidate is able to make impressive points of evaluation on how different models and factors impact one another.

Synthesising information to structure and sustain lines of argument

This response was awarded **8 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate has a clear line of argument that is based on points of analysis and evaluation throughout the response. Their overall conclusion is impressively written as the candidate critiques the different models examined. There is clear rebuttal to a counter-argument: ‘...however, this has shown to be short term as the actions of politicians have far more impact than their persona...’ The candidate writes in a thoughtful, intelligent way that shows their understanding of the complexity and interconnected nature of factors that impact voting behaviour.

Overall, this response was awarded **29 out of 30 marks**.

This is an extremely high-quality response that displays an in-depth understanding of the issue.