

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

Question 10

To what extent can source B be considered trustworthy?

Analysis

This response was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because the candidate displays a clear understanding of the question as well as knowledge of social science research. There are relevant links to the source and evidence from the source is analysed well. For example, ‘... Paul Morgan-Bentley ... highlighting the fact that he is highly likely to be experienced in analysing different investigations.’ Analytical comments are linked to evaluative comments throughout the response, and the candidate shows their knowledge of social science research with excellent insight into covert participant observation.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because there are evaluative comments made throughout the response that clearly explain the strengths and weaknesses of the source. For example, ‘This makes the source less trustworthy since readers are actually often going to be blocked from further analysing the source since they are forced to pay in order to see it.’ There is reference to additional research too, for example, ‘...which gives the reader the chance to investigate the issue further...’, however, there is no consideration of alternative approaches which limits the marks in this section.

Conclusion

This response was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because there is a detailed overall conclusion that makes a clear, quantifiable judgement, such as ‘mostly trustworthy’. The line of argument integrates points of analysis and evaluation to support the overall judgement by weighing up both the strengths and weaknesses of the source.

Bias, covert participant observation, the paywall and date are all evaluated in this well-written overall conclusion.

Overall, this response was awarded **14 out of 15 marks**.

Candidate 2

Question 10

To what extent can source B be considered trustworthy?

Analysis

This response was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because the candidate analyses key aspects of the source's trustworthiness, including the date, authorship and the fact that the source was adapted. The candidate identifies relevant links to the source and includes relevant supporting evidence. It does not, however, achieve full marks as it does not link sufficient aspects with knowledge of social science research.

Evaluation

This response was awarded **3 out of 6 marks** because 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 in this response. Moreover, judgements on the strengths and weaknesses are not supported 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 3 marks** because the concluding remarks lack a clear, quantifiable judgement, and simply summarises the key points.

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