

Commentary on Social Science candidate evidence

How does the media influence voting behaviour?

Assessor: graded A

Verifier: graded B

Project proposal

This proposal has a very broad topic. The candidate has clear aims that provide good opportunities for skills development. It is sufficiently challenging, but as it is very broad, this means that evidence is not available to show that it is time realistic, achievable and practical which means the candidate has not met the first A criterion.

The candidate has not indicated how the project meets the second A criterion in terms of robustness. The candidate could have provided more evidence on how the project will focus, and the actual influence that media has on voting behaviour, keeping the title at the forefront of the project.

The candidate has provided information on substantial links and understanding of possible connections across disciplines contributing to the project, which meets the third A criterion.

Generally, the written evidence provided by the candidate is brief. The broad contexts should have a full explanation that is linked to the proposal. Writing a full report will support the communication provided by the candidate and the assessor/verifier in awarding the grade C and A criteria.

All C criteria have been met along with the third A criterion.

Project plan

The plan expands on the outline from the proposal and has met all the C criteria.

The project is still broad, but the plan has provided a list of objectives that the candidate aims to achieve during this project development.

The resources and research techniques meet the C criteria. There is evidence of few resources and research/investigation techniques to meet the A grade criteria. It is more of a generic strategy and does not seem to include resources and research/investigation on what the project is based on - 'how does the media influence voting behaviour'. There is also no indication within the plan of how any of the contacts will be used or what information is needed to allow the project to meet its aims. This means that the first A criterion has not been met.

The contingencies are not strong, but the candidate has considered suitable alternatives meeting the second A criterion.

The planning is listed by month and these timescales should be achievable. Some of this information can be gathered from the dependencies and record keeping plan, but the candidate should have clearly identified these in the timescales and planning section, therefore the second and third C criteria have just been met. This also means that the A criterion for 'Clear identification of dependencies or reliance on the success of other strands of work and of necessary adjustments to the plan' cannot be met, as the candidate, in the dependencies section, has not indicated what is to happen if information is not gathered and milestones are not met.

The candidate has given consideration to their process for achieving their development needs.

All C criteria have been met and the second and fourth A criteria.

Presentation of project findings/product

The candidate has provided little evidence of how they presented their project findings and the detail is limited. The assessor's feedback to the candidate in this section has provided more evidence and further evidence can be found in the project evaluation and the candidate's self-evaluation by the assessor using a holistic approach. Candidates should use the assessment criteria to ensure they fully communicate their findings in all sections. The C criteria have been evidenced.

Little evidence was found to support the first A criterion for 'Critical thinking, analysis and reflection used at key stages in the project to construct rigorous arguments, draw convincing, well supported conclusions, identify and resolve issues'. The assessor comments do not identify where the A criteria have been met but evidence can be found using the holistic approach that was applied to the candidate gaining the C criteria in this section, therefore the second and third A criteria have been met. The candidate has managed to refrain from continually using the internet as the only form of communication.

All C criteria have been met along with the second and third A criteria.

Evaluation of project

The breadth of the project title still causes issues when completing the evaluation of the project as it is difficult for the candidate to clearly link the findings to the actual project title. The candidate has given a well-balanced evaluation of the project but and has explained the weakness in the presentation methods.

It is also evident here that the candidate went beyond internet research and actually went to the library and interviewed the MSP.

The assessor could have commented on how the A and the C criteria have been met.

All C and A criteria have been met.

Self-evaluation of generic/cognitive skills development

The candidate has provided an in-depth self-evaluation which meets the C criteria.

It is noted that the candidate now refers to citizenship as the broad context whereas they were looking at employability in the proposal.

There is limited evidence of 'assertive and justified use of feedback from others in evaluation and identification of development areas', therefore this second A criterion cannot be awarded.

All C criteria have been met along with the first A criterion.

Overview

Given that there are several A grade criteria which should not have been awarded, this project should now be graded as a B.