

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Question 7

‘Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed.’

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

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 the US, China, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and Iran. Coverage includes discussion on the media, statistics, law, culture and the context of time, referencing information from McRobbie and Thornton. The candidate also has included extensive analysis of definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime, fully engaging with the requirements of the question. 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. The candidate clearly compares by using phrases such as 'There is a similar situation in the US...', 'This is unlike countries such as China in which...' and 'This is in stark contrast to the law in the UK...' Information about international comparators is well-integrated into each paragraph and forms a key part of the candidate's line of argument throughout.

Evaluation

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

The candidate makes reasoned points of evaluation throughout the response, and these are well-evidenced. Judgements are made, for example that 'Measurements of crime are therefore not fixed and there is therefore also a gap...', 'While it would be unreasonable to suggest that these surveys...' and 'However, the British media is not perfect and ...'. The candidate gives valid reasons for discounting the notion that definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are both fixed and not fixed and gives alternative reasons, such as culture and societal contexts, to clearly support their overall conclusion.

Synthesis

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 that definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed. The overall conclusion is balanced and addresses the counterargument, as well as a direct response to the posed question.

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

Question 8

‘Early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate includes detailed points of analysis throughout their answer which show an in-depth understanding of the question. Early intervention, police strategies and multi-agency approaches are all discussed in detail, as well as specific factors such as Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES) and the UK Violence Reduction Unit (VRU). Exemplification is of a very high standard throughout and international comparisons are integrated throughout the response. Moreover, the candidate factors in the ideas of others, such as Carnochan, with their own and is therefore awarded full marks in this section.

Comparison

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

There are detailed international comparisons throughout the response. The Midnight and Beyond programme in West Granton is compared with the Community Parent Education Programme in Sweden, early intervention services in the UK are compared to those in the US and the New York Neighbourhood Policing Programme is compared with Scottish community policing. Violence Reduction Units in the UK are compared with Chicago. 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 'These programmes are incredibly important as...', 'It is likely such an effective approach because...', 'However, for early intervention to work...' and 'However, both community policing and hot spot policing can be seen as....' 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.

Synthesis

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 counterarguments: 'Overall, each policing strategy has its advantages and disadvantages, but ultimately ...' and 'However, the police are much less effective than early intervention and even multi agency approaches...' The candidate writes in an insightful way, showing their understanding of the complexity and interconnected nature of whether early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.

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

Question 9

You are researching the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences (PASS) in Scotland.

To what extent would focus groups be the best method for investigating this issue?

You should include reference to an alternative method(s) in addition to focus groups.

**In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.
(15 marks)**

Analysis

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

The candidate analyses official statistics and postal surveys as alternative research methods to focus groups. The candidate provides detailed comment on the strengths and weaknesses of each method. This is supported by relevant and detailed evidence, including the Brexit referendum, focus groups in Sweden and Silverman. The response demonstrates clear knowledge of social science research methods.

Evaluation

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

The candidate addresses the specified scenario throughout the response, for example identifying whether or not sending people to prison for short periods of time is helpful because it allows offenders to maintain family links and employment. Official statistics are evaluated in terms of assessing the impact of short prison sentences (PASS) on reoffending. The scenario is integrated throughout, and not

simply 'tagged on'. The ethical issues of privacy and confidentiality are considered in relation to covert observation, and anonymity is covered in respect of focus groups and official statistics.

Conclusion

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

The overall conclusion makes a clear judgement as to the preferred method, official statistics, with focus groups and postal surveys less preferred in relation to the specified scenario. The candidate's line of argument integrates well with their preceding analysis and evaluation. Valid reasons for preferring official statistics and for rejecting postal surveys and focus groups are provided.

Overall, this response was awarded **15 out of 15 marks**.

Question 10

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

Analysis

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

The candidate analyses key aspects of the source, including methodology, authorship and the date of the source. The response achieves full marks as it links sufficient aspects with knowledge of social science research.

Evaluation

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

There are valid evaluative comments made about the methodology, authorship and the date of the source. Judgements about the relative strengths and weaknesses are

supported by reference to relevant additional research. Moreover, the judgement includes consideration of alternative approaches which could increase the trustworthiness of the source, by conducting multiple interviews with members of the government as well as politicians who hold different posts from a range of political parties.

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.

Overall, this response was awarded **15 out of 15 marks**.

In total, this candidate was awarded **90 out of 90 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 2

Question 7

‘Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate’s response contains detailed examples of analysis. The candidate examines crime statistics, the role of the media in both the UK and US and changing public opinion of crime. There is excellent exemplification with contemporary and relevant evidence used throughout the response to a very high standard.

International comparison is integrated in-depth with analytical comments. However, the candidate incorrectly states that Becker was the theorist who believed people should ‘follow their morals’. This means that the candidate cannot be awarded the mark for integrating the ideas and arguments of others with their own and is thus awarded 7 marks.

Comparison

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

Points of international comparison are made throughout the response and form a key part of the line of argument. The candidate uses excellent international examples and explains the extent of the similarity or difference with the UK. The candidate compares the UK to the US, pointing out similarities between the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey and FBI records. The portrayal of violent crime in the media in the UK is further compared to the US. The penultimate paragraph explains differences in

laws in the UK and Saudi Arabia as well as pointing out similarities between cities in Scotland and the US becoming safer. This response is an example of high-quality international comparison that is fully integrated throughout the answer.

Evaluation

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

While there are reasoned points of evaluation that are used to make an overall judgement on the question, there is not enough reasoned evaluation on alternative arguments. The candidate briefly considers alternative arguments that the definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime may be fixed but does not develop or evaluate these points further. For example, the candidate acknowledges that 'their perception of same sex marriage is fixed and hasn't changed much over time'. However, the vast majority of this response only considers the arguments that definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are changing and not fixed. This means the candidate is capped at 5 marks for this section.

Synthesis

This response was awarded **6 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

There is a clear line of argument throughout the response that is supported by detailed reasons and excellent evidence. The overall conclusion makes a judgement on the question asked by concluding that 'peoples definition of crime remains unfixed'. The candidate responds to a counter argument by stating that although the measurement of crime may be 'a more fixed approach', this is in contrast to definitions and perceptions of crime which 'remain unfixed to a very large extent'. However, the lack of detailed consideration and evaluation of alternative views throughout the response limits the candidate's marks in this section. While the overall conclusion contains analysis and evaluation, this is not evident throughout the response and therefore their line of argument and overall judgement cannot be said to have been based on several points of analysis or evaluation.

Overall, this response was awarded **24 out of 30 marks**.

Question 8

‘Early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.’

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

Analysis

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

There is an abundance of relevant and contemporary supporting evidence throughout. Interesting examples, such as opportunities for children in Malawi, are analysed well. Points of analysis are linked to evaluative comments and, overall, the analysis shows that the candidate has a clear, in-depth understanding of the question. Furthermore, analytical comments integrate the ideas of others with the candidate’s own, including explaining the ideas of Graham Allen and Thomas Hobbes. This is an excellent example of high-quality analysis, and the candidate is awarded full marks in this section.

Comparison

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

Points of international comparison are integrated throughout and form a key part of the line of argument. International examples are compared to the UK/Scotland and similarities are discussed. For example, the candidate states ‘This shows that in Malawi early intervention is really working which is similar to in Scotland’ and ‘In New Zealand they have a very similar approach...’.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **6 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

There is reasoned consideration and evaluation of alternative arguments. For example, the candidate weighs up the strengths and weaknesses of hotspot policing as well as comparing early intervention to multi-agency approaches and policing strategies. However, the evaluation is not always consistent throughout the response. The candidate could have had a clearer focus on early intervention being the best strategy throughout every paragraph, as well as acknowledging criticisms or perceived weaknesses of early intervention for top marks in this section.

Synthesis

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

While there is a clear overall conclusion that is developed from a sustained line of argument, the conclusion does not recognise or respond to a relevant counterargument. The overall conclusion gives detailed reasons why a combination of early intervention and other strategies is the best way to prevent future crime but does not offer any alternative perspectives. This means the marks are capped at 5 out of 8 for this section.

Overall, this response was awarded **25 out of 30 marks**.

Question 9

You are researching the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences (PASS) in Scotland.

To what extent would focus groups be the best method for investigating this issue?

You should include reference to an alternative method(s) in addition to focus groups.

**In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.
(15 marks)**

Analysis

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

There is clear understanding of the question and knowledge of research methods displayed. The candidate includes relevant evidence to support their answer. For example, they mention focus groups conducted at Manchester University as well as surveys conducted by the NHS and UCAS. Analytical comments are linked to evaluative comments, for example, '...telephone survey may be better for some parts of the research...but for the more sensitive discussions around short sentences a focus group would be the better option'.

Evaluation

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

The candidate shows a very good understanding of how the research method would be effective in relation to the specified scenario. For example, the candidate states 'the researcher may not have thought about the potential impact on families that

short sentences have'. The specific scenario is integrated throughout the response in a thoughtful way. However, the candidate fails to address any ethical issues and so is capped at 5 out of 6 marks for this section.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **2 out of the 3 marks** available for this element.

The conclusion makes it clear that focus groups would be the best way to investigate the impact of PASS. This is supported by an explanation that focus groups would allow the researcher to develop 'a deep understanding of the opinions and experiences of a group of people'. However, the candidate does not explain why they rejected surveys or interviews, which prevents them from achieving full marks in this section.

Overall, this response was awarded **13 out of 15 marks**.

Question 10

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

Analysis

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

The candidate identifies the key aspects that indicate whether the source is trustworthy or not. They identify relevant links, include evidence from the source and link analysis to evaluative comments. For example, they state 'Source B has no graphs...which makes it more difficult for readers to pick out key pieces of information.... means that source B is an untrustworthy source'. However, the candidate fails to fully link aspects of the source with their own knowledge. While the point about interview bias may be creditworthy, there are not enough points made

that show the candidate's own knowledge to be awarded the final mark in this section.

Evaluation

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

The candidate addresses both the strengths and the weaknesses of the source and shows some knowledge about conducting social science research. Additional research is mentioned, for example, 'if the reader wishes to research the institute more they can do that by using the link at the bottom of the source'. However, there is no consideration of alternative approaches that may increase the trustworthiness of the source.

Conclusion

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

There is not a clear overall judgement in the concluding remarks. The candidate starts the conclusion by stating the source is untrustworthy to a small extent but at the end of the paragraph, concludes that the source is 'untrustworthy to a large extent'. This lack of clarity means the candidate cannot gain more than 1 mark in this section.

Overall, this response was awarded **11 out of 15 marks**.

In total, this candidate was awarded **73 out of 90 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 3

Question 7

‘Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate includes detailed points of analysis throughout their answer which show an understanding of the question. The candidate discusses the role of the media in shaping perceptions, PRC and SCJS in terms of measuring crime, and changing laws in respect of definitions of crime, albeit through a lens of discussing perceptions. Exemplification is of a high standard throughout and the candidate integrates the ideas of others, Cohen and Young, with their own. While the candidate has a number of international examples, these are not integrated in-depth with the analytical comments. Additionally, the failure to deal more explicitly and fully with the alternative argument that definitions, measurements and perceptions are ‘fixed’, means they have not demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the question. As such, the response is prevented from achieving full marks in this section.

Comparison

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

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK, Canada and Turkey. There is information about Canada’s media reporting and PRC in Turkey. These international comparators are supported by relevant and contemporary evidence. There is also mention of ‘yellow journalism’ in the US, Norway abolishing the death penalty and

Australia using similar surveys. However, these comparisons lack depth and more detailed exploration of these would be required to score more highly in this section.

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 overall conclusion. Judgements are made, for example, that perceptions are skewed, constantly changing and are not fixed throughout. However, there is only one implicit point about them being fixed, when discussing how the SCJS does not change perceptions. The lack of reasoning, evaluation or judgement beyond this on alternative arguments, caps the mark in this section.

Synthesis

This response was awarded **4 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

There is a line of argument and an overall conclusion providing a judgement on the question. However, the candidate does not include a response to at least one relevant counterargument, and the line of argument is not sustained enough on the set question to score more highly. Their line of argument focuses on perceptions being skewed and changing/ not fixed throughout, with little treatment of the alternative viewpoint on this.

Overall, this response was awarded **20 out of 30 marks**.

Question 8

‘Early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate includes detailed points of analysis on EEI, policing strategies and multi-agency approaches to reducing future crime. There is a clear understanding of the question with good evidence from both the UK and the US. Coverage includes discussion on Stop and Search, GIRFEC, SVRU and Navigator. The response clearly understands the complexities of the set question and supports a convincing line of argument. However, there are no views of others integrated with the candidate’s own, so the response cannot achieve the eighth mark in this section.

Comparison

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

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK and various US-based approaches, looking at New York’s Stop and Frisk programme, Chicago’s Violence Reduction Strategy (VRS), and the US Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). These international comparators are integrated into the line of argument but could form a more key part of their line of argument.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **6 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes reasoned points of evaluation, with a clear line of argument. They explore the benefits and potential pitfalls of EEI, stop and search and the approaches of the SVRU, with judgements on which of these three is the best strategy to reduce further crime. The evaluation could be stronger and better integrated with their line of argument, and the overall conclusion does not clearly outline why they are accepting EEI, though they have explained why they are discounting the other two.

Synthesis

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

There is a clear line of argument, supported by detailed reasons and evidence. The overall conclusion follows from the points made throughout. However, while the candidate states that stop and search and SVRU do not have enough reach and success, they stop short of outlining the reasons why EEI is the most successful and effective, simply stating the benefits and successes outweigh the pitfalls.

Overall, this response was awarded **23 out of 30 marks**.

Question 9

You are researching the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences (PASS) in Scotland.

To what extent would focus groups be the best method for investigating this issue?

You should include reference to an alternative method(s) in addition to focus groups.

**In your answer you should make reference to relevant examples.
(15 marks)**

Analysis

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

The candidate identifies and analyses key aspects of the research method. The response includes analysis of observer bias, sampling and the time-consuming nature of research. The Millennium Cohort Study is referred to, though not named, with correct information about the number of participants in this birth cohort study. The candidate does not, however, link the aspects being analysed to the scenario, beyond just dropping the words 'impacts of PASS' into each paragraph.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **2 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The evaluative comments do not address the specified scenario. This, therefore, prevents them from scoring more highly in this section.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **2 out of the 3 marks** available for this element.

The conclusion follows from a line of argument and it is clear which method is preferred. However, the point about qualitative data and face-to-face surveys was deemed to be an incorrect judgement, preventing the response from securing full marks in this section.

Overall, this response was awarded **7 out of 15 marks**.

Question 10

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

Analysis

This response was awarded **2 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes one developed point about the authorship of the source, though the point is explained in quite a simplistic way, and two short points about the date and the weblink provided. These points need to be further explained to score more highly.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **2 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate makes only one developed point about authorship of the source. Further examination of the strengths and weakness of the source and knowledge about conducting social science research would improve the response.

Conclusion

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

The concluding remarks summarise the key points made, but there is no judgement on the extent of trustworthiness of the source.

Overall, this response was awarded **5 out of 15 marks**.

In total, this candidate was awarded **55 out of 90 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 4

Question 7

‘Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate analyses a range of factors relevant to the question, including definitions of crime, police recorded statistics and types of crime. Evidence is provided from the UK/Scotland, Scandinavian countries and the US. However, the depth of treatment in terms of applying relevant supporting evidence from each is varied in terms of quality and provenance, for example, David Cameron’s 2010 ‘Broken Britain’. Analytical comments are not integrated in-depth with international comparators, or with the ideas and arguments of others.

Comparison

This response was awarded **1 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK/Scotland, the US and Scandinavian countries. There is information about drink driving, definitions of crime in the UK compared to Scandinavian countries and media reporting on mass shootings in the US. However, comments are descriptive and lack exemplification or development. Points of comparison also do not form a key part of the line of argument.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **4 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 to support the candidate's line of argument, for example that 'Police recorded statistics are a good way to see crime levels however...' and 'however, in some Scandinavian countries it is illegal to do so and therefore this definitely...'. The mark in this section is capped at 4 as no alternative arguments are discussed.

Synthesis

This response was awarded **3 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The conclusion provides an overall judgement of the question, that definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed, supported by valid reasoning. However, it is not derived from a sustained line or argument developed by organising, linking or sequencing ideas throughout the response. The overall conclusion also does not include a convincing response to at least one relevant counterargument.

Overall, this response was awarded **13 out of 30 marks**.

Question 8

‘Early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.’

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

Analysis

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

The candidate analyses a wide range of factors relevant to the question, including zero tolerance policy, community policing, and multi-agency approaches. Analysis builds to making evaluative judgements and evidence is provided from the UK/Scotland, the US and Scandinavian countries. However, the depth and quality of treatment in terms of applying relevant supporting evidence from each is varied. Analytical comments are not integrated in-depth with internal comparators, or with the ideas and arguments of others.

Comparison

This response was awarded **2 out of the 6 marks** available for this element.

The candidate draws comparisons between the UK/Scotland, the US and Scandinavian countries. There is information about Joe Biden’s zero tolerance policy on gun dealing and organised drug gangs in Scandinavian countries. These international comparators are supported by relevant and contemporary evidence. However, points of comparison are vague and not fully explained. They are also not fully integrated into the candidate’s line of argument.

Evaluation

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

The candidate makes valid, reasoned points relevant to their line of argument. There is reasoned consideration of alternative arguments and evidence, for example 'However, community policing relies heavily on...', 'However it is mostly effective in already low crime areas...' and 'However critics argue that, many crimes are not planned in advanced...'. Although the candidate makes clear judgements of alternative arguments and evidence, points of evaluation are not integrated throughout their line of argument. In addition, they do not provide reasons for discounting or accepting alternatives to clearly support their overall conclusion.

Synthesis

This response was awarded **3 out of the 8 marks** available for this element.

The conclusion provides a relevant overall judgement that addresses the specific question of whether early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime. However, the overall conclusion is not derived from a sustained line of argument developed by organising, linking or sequencing ideas throughout the response. The overall conclusion also does not include a convincing response to at least one relevant counterargument. Moreover, the line of argument does not integrate points of analysis and evaluation in the preceding discussion to support their overall judgement.

Overall, this response was awarded **15 out of 30 marks**.

Question 9

You are researching the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences (PASS) in Scotland.

To what extent would focus groups be the best method for investigating this issue?

You should include reference to an alternative method(s) in addition to focus groups. (15 marks)

Analysis

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

The candidate identifies and analyses key aspects of the research method and links them to presumption against short prison sentences. The response includes analysis of the depth of information and varied opinions which can be sought using focus groups. The candidate also identifies relevant links to the scenario by commenting that participants can 'talk freely about their sentence'. However, there is no relevant and contemporary supporting evidence included in their response which limits the mark in this section.

Evaluation

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

The candidate addresses the specified scenario of PASS throughout the response. The scenario is well-integrated into each point, and not simply 'tagged on'. Confidentiality is discussed as an ethical issue in relation to focus groups and privacy in relation to semi-structured interviews.

Conclusion

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

The conclusion makes a clear judgement as to the preferred method: semi-structured, one-to-one interviews in relation to the specified scenario. The candidate's line of argument integrates well with their preceding analysis and evaluation. Valid reasons for preferring this method and for rejecting focus groups are also provided.

Overall, this response was awarded **12 out of 15 marks**.

Question 10

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

Analysis

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

The candidate analyses key aspects of the source's trustworthiness, including the authorship, methodology and the fact that the source was adapted. The candidate identifies relevant links with the source and includes relevant supporting evidence. It does not achieve full marks as it does not link sufficient aspects with knowledge of social science research.

Evaluation

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

The candidate makes reasoned points of evaluation about the trustworthiness of the source. Strengths and weaknesses of the source are also addressed. However, there is a distinct lack of knowledge about social science research referred to in the response. Moreover, judgements on the strengths and weaknesses are unsupported

by reference to additional alternative research or sources which could help increase the trustworthiness of the source.

Conclusion

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

The concluding remarks simply summarise the key points covered in the preceding part of this component.

Overall, this response was awarded **9 out of 15 marks**.

In total, this candidate was awarded **49 out of 90 marks** for the question paper.