

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Law and Order — Part B: Source evaluation

Question 16

To what extent can source B be considered trustworthy? (15)

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 15 marks** because they achieved the following marks in each assessable element:

Analysis of a source

This response was awarded **3 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate analyses key aspects of the source, including the authorship, size of the sample and age. Links are identified but some of the supporting evidence is inaccurate.

Evaluation of trustworthiness

This response was awarded **3 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

There are evaluative comments made about the authorship, the date of the source and age range. However, it is limited by the judgements, eg the candidate suggests it is untrustworthy as the sample size is too small.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **1 out of the 3 marks** available for this element.

There is no quantifying of the extent of justification for the conclusion, eg 'overall the positives... outweigh the negatives'.

Candidate 2

Political Issues — Part B: Source evaluation

Question 8

To what extent can source A be considered trustworthy? (15)

The candidate was awarded **14 out of 15 marks** because they achieved the following marks in each assessable element:

Analysis of a source

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

The candidate analyses key aspects of the source, including the authorship, sampling size and type as well as the date of the source. The response achieves full marks as it links sufficient aspects with knowledge of social science research, eg Ipsos as a large and trustworthy polling organisation.

Evaluation of trustworthiness

This response was awarded **5 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

There are valid evaluative comments made about the authorship, sampling frame and the date of the source. Judgements about the relative strengths and weaknesses are supported by reference to relevant additional research, eg contact the Head of Ipsos Gideon Skinner for more information using the email provided. However, the judgement does not include consideration of alternative approaches which could increase the trustworthiness of the source.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **3 out of the 3 marks** available for this element.

The conclusion makes a clear, quantified and reasoned judgement about the extent to which the source can be trusted. This follows on from a coherent line of argument supported by reasons/evidence. In addition, the line of argument integrates valid points of analysis and evaluation to support the overall judgement expressed in the concluding remarks.