Candidate 3 - Should the Scottish Government do more to restrict alcohol consumption?

Candidate 3's Assignment has achieved the following marks for each aspect of the Coursework Assessment task.

The candidate's response sets out the topic and mentions three separate options without going into a great deal of detail. Two figures are used, both are from the research sheets – 3.5 billion is actually for the whole of the UK, but the £900 figure does support the candidate's assertion that the topic is important. **2 marks (knowledge)** were awarded for framing the issue.

Arguments for Minimum Pricing
In the first paragraph, the candidate makes reference to 'Source B' and uses the information to explain how to reduce binge drinking. This was awarded **1 mark (analysis).**

In the second paragraph the candidate expands their use/analysis of the previous point and was awarded a further **1 mark (analysis).**

In the third paragraph, **1 analysis mark** was awarded which further develops this point using a relevant reference to Source E2 that all drinkers will not be affected equally. This is further developed by information from Source B1 which highlights the impact on 'harmful drinkers' – **1 mark (analysis)**

The candidate also references Source E4 but this was a slight misinterpretation and so no further mark was awarded.

The candidate argues that Minimum Unit Pricing is more effective than a ban on below cost selling and makes reference to Sources E2 and E3. The candidate tries to form an argument using pieces of information from Source E3 – **2 marks (analysis).**

Under the heading 'Increasing the legal alcohol drinking age to 21' the candidate discusses the damage to teenagers and uses Source E1 to show the extent of the problem **– 1 mark (analysis)**.

The candidate relies heavily on Source A to support their argument in this section and parts are copied. However a further **analysis mark** is awarded for: 'This is why the alcohol drinking age should be increased to 21 to prevent the many hazardous side effects to children under 15'.

The candidate also uses their own knowledge to support their earlier analysis and is awarded **1 knowledge mark.**

Under the heading 'Government Campaigns' the candidate shows knowledge of a government campaign and argues that it is a good thing. This is relevant knowledge and was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate uses Source D and combines two different pieces of information to support drink driving campaigns – **2 marks (analysis)**

Arguments against Minimum Pricing
In this section there is synthesis of information from Source E2 and Source E3 combined with what could be a conclusion as to why Minimum Unit Pricing cannot be used. However, no clear decision has been communicated yet. The final sentence requires more detail to achieve a further mark.

Under the heading 'Increasing the legal alcohol drinking age to 21' the candidate uses information from Source E1 to oppose the increase in the legal drinking age: 'it has already decreased'. This is effectively combined with information from Source C – **2 marks (analysis). The candidate has, however, already achieved full marks for analysis.**

Under the Government Campaigns (Against) section, the candidate uses knowledge to argue against the effectiveness of government campaigns, eg 85% and 66%. **2 marks (knowledge)**

The Rebuttal section is confused and does not seem logical in this position. As the candidate has not yet stated their decision it is difficult for them to effectively 're-but' arguments against it. The first paragraph could perhaps be considered a 'conclusion' (referring to the main reasons for supporting Minimum Pricing) but it is not clear if this is the decision.

The second paragraph of this section works poorly as a rebuttal but possibly better as a conclusion in support of government campaigns. However, it is still not clear what the decision is.

The candidate provides a clear decision and supports it with some brief evidence. Reference is then made to the rejected options. The candidate provides no evaluation of the relative importance of factors supporting the decision. **2 marks (decision/conclusion)**

The candidate provides a comparison of Sources E4 and E1 but is too simplistic to be awarded any marks.

The candidate provides another simplistic point but this is better than the previous point. They appear slightly confused about the distinction between 'reliable' and 'useful', but the comment is awarded **1 mark (evaluation)**

In terms of the structure, the report is fairly informal, eg 'I' in the conclusion. Headings are used but the rebuttal section is confused due to a lack of clarity in the decision. There is no necessity to state the decision early in the report but in this instance it would have helped the candidate to follow the arguments. The candidate does refer to both the sources and knowledge and does use some appropriate terminology. **3 marks (structure)**

Knowledge   **7**
Analysis/Synthesis **10**
Source Evaluation **1**
Structure   **3**
Decision   **2**

The candidate was awarded 23/30 marks for this Assignment.

Knowledge   **7**
Analysis/Synthesis **10**