

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each element of the assignment.

Candidate 1

Title: Scotland's future

The candidate introduces their topic and their three options. This will contribute to their structure marks. The candidate develops the idea of political parties wanting different things and gives an example of powers which are devolved. This was awarded **1 framing knowledge and understanding (KU) mark**. The final sentence gives some relevant background information about the 2014 referendum. This was awarded **1 framing KU mark**.

Under the background knowledge heading the candidate gives information on the different views of three political parties. The paragraph explains the viewpoint of the SNP, Conservative party and Labour party. The section on the Conservative party is slightly muddled, however, the candidate does give a good overview of the three conflicting viewpoints. **(2 framing KU marks awarded for this paragraph)**.

Next the candidate lays out again the three options they will be studying. This will contribute towards the structure mark.

In the first paragraph under the 'Scottish independence advantages and disadvantages' heading the candidate merely explains what independence would mean for Scotland. This is not awarded any marks as marks have already been given for difference in devolved and reserved issues in introduction.

The second paragraph focuses on the argument around Scotland being continually out voted by England and gives an example from the Thatcher era. While this is dated, it is still relevant when linked to the creation of the Scottish Parliament and government. **(1 KU in support of analysis mark awarded)**

The third paragraph is vague, however, the point about Scotland being financially better off and improving public spending is awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**.

The candidate then moves on to look at the disadvantages of Scottish independence. This paragraph focuses on the impact of violent separatist movements. The argument that this could be seen as terrorism and then the example of Catalonia being used is not relevant or linked well enough to Scotland. This argument is invalid because if Scotland was newly independent it

would be an example of a democratic movement, eg through the ballot box and not an example of a violent movement (0 marks awarded).

The next paragraph under this heading does give a valid disadvantage as it discusses the idea of leaving the UK and the EU. The first sentence until 'independent from the UK' was **awarded 1 KU mark** as it states that Scotland would be less well-off out of both of the EU and the UK. The candidate then gives a valid example of Scotland being £13billion less well-off being out of the EU and links this to Brexit and Theresa May's government. However, this argument is in the wrong context as this would be an argument for becoming independent and leaving the UK but re-joining the EU, so the candidate is not awarded any marks.

The final argument is about North Sea Oil. The candidate correctly points out that oil will not last forever and refers to a government report suggesting 2040 as the projected date for the oil to run out. (**1 KU in support of analysis mark awarded**).

In the first paragraph under the 'Maximum devolution in Scotland advantages and disadvantages' heading the candidate gives a definition of 'devolution max' and explains why this may be seen by some as a stepping stone to independence and by others as a way of making Scotland feel in control. The candidate gives an example of extra powers given by the Scotland Act. This whole paragraph is worth **1 framing KU mark** as it develops the idea of the second option and puts it in its political context despite the wrong date for Scotland Act.

The next paragraph develops the idea of sharing resources like the army but is not well expressed and is too confused. (0 marks awarded).

The final paragraph under this heading is not awarded any marks as the candidate is confused and offers no coherent argument on devo-max.

In the first paragraph under the Direct London rule heading the candidate states that if Scotland was just ruled directly by London, then this would be easier because there wouldn't be a different legal system etc. This point is not valid as when Scotland was ruled directly by London (ie pre-devolution), they still had a different legal and education system. (0 marks awarded).

The disadvantage section states that Scotland would not get the government they vote for due to population size and only having 59 seats in the Parliament. This is then developed by stating that this makes people feel unrepresented and will negatively impact turnout. (**1 KU in support of analysis mark awarded**).

The conclusion states that Scottish Independence is the best option especially if Scotland can re-join the EU. This was awarded **1 decision mark**.

The candidate was awarded another **1 decision mark** as they explain why they rejected direct London rule due to voting behaviour being different in Scotland and England.

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- ◆ **1 structure mark** for using appropriate headings and sections.
- ◆ **1 structure mark** for appropriate terminology

The candidate was not awarded the marks for referring to evidence as they have not used their research sheet at all and have zero analysis marks.

The candidate was not awarded the mark for logic of argument as they put arguments in the wrong place and many of their arguments are confused.

Source evaluation is not included so no marks were awarded.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 14 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 10 marks
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 0 marks
- C: Source evaluation: 0 marks
- D: Structure: 2 marks
- E: Reaching a decision: 2 marks

Candidate 2

Title: Underage drinking in the UK

The candidate identifies an appropriate modern studies issue about which there are alternative views and a decision can be made. The candidate provides detailed explanations of the background to the issue.

The candidate begins by discussing binge drinking and the recommended units for men and women. This information is correct (although they have typed 18 instead of 8) – **1 framing knowledge and understanding (KU) mark** awarded.

Evidence on the extent of underage drinking is provided: 'Underage drinking is clearly a problem ...at least once.' Further exemplification is provided 'Of the 70% a further 70% ...' and the candidate explains that almost half have been drunk before. Both points together were awarded **1 framing KU mark**. A further piece of framing evidence is provided about MUP and another **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In the next paragraph the candidate discusses alcohol consumption, and a **KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded for the information down to 'damaging their health'. They then discuss the fact that 'Almost half of all the drink sold in Scotland in 2017 ...new higher prices' and this was awarded **1 framing KU mark**. An example of Frosty Jack was a straight lift from the research sheet and was awarded no marks.

In the next paragraph the candidate discusses the impact on the NHS, with 22 deaths a week. This, along with the next sentence on the poor being more likely to die as a result was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**. A further **1 framing KU mark** was awarded for the sentence 'This problem has trebled since the early 1990's...'

The candidate has now achieved the maximum number of framing knowledge marks available.

The candidate does not state which of the three options they have chosen. This is not necessarily a problem and is certainly not mandatory.

Under the Option 1 heading, the candidate opens with evidence from source 1: 'If the age is 18 ...' They analyse this information and **1 analysis mark** was awarded. They then provide evidence of impact of alcohol on female liver and **1 KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded. The candidate then discusses US Drinking Act and the increase in the drinking age and a further **1 KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded. This is compared with Scotland using information from source 2 and was awarded **1 analysis mark**. This is synthesised with source 3, a survey, and was awarded a further **1 analysis mark**.

A further **1 KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded for detailing underage drinking. Further information about the cost to the economy is provided and was awarded **1 further KU in support of analysis mark**.

The candidate then discusses the survey results. Although there is no source 4 labelled 'source 4' on the research sheet, the candidate is referring to the survey and was **awarded 1 analysis mark**. This is synthesised with source 5 and was awarded **1 further analysis mark**. This is further linked with source 6 which shows that 'almost a fifth of 12th graders ...' and was awarded **1 further analysis mark**. The candidate is getting mixed up with source numbers but was not penalised. Finally, **1 further analysis mark** was awarded for development of the 'they can vote at 18' quote from source 7.

Under the Option 2 heading the candidate references source 9, the survey, and the question on strictness of current laws. This was awarded **1 analysis mark**. This is synthesised with a point about affordability of alcohol and, along with, the discussion of the decrease in boy's drinking was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**. This is synthesised with source 11 and decreasing alcohol consumption in Wales, which was awarded **1 further analysis mark**. A further **1 KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded for discussion of female drinking and **1 analysis mark awarded** for synthesis with source 12.

At the bottom of the page the candidate discusses efforts in Scotland and was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**. This is further synthesised with detail about where young people buy their alcohol and was awarded a further **1 KU in support of analysis mark**. The candidate discusses the impact of MUP on the cost of alcohol and uses Frosty Jack's as an example. This was awarded **1 analysis mark** but no knowledge marks. The candidate then discusses the fact that only 20% of young people have jobs and this was awarded **1 further KU in support of analysis mark**. The candidate ends with reference to their survey and uses this evidence to draw a conclusion on why this is not the best option and was awarded **1 conclusion/decision mark**.

Under the Option 3 heading the candidate begins by discussing a reason why the drinking age should be decreased by referencing their survey. They use this information to argue that there is no point in reducing it and was awarded **1 analysis mark**. This is further supported with evidence and analysis from source 16 and was awarded another **1 analysis mark**. The candidate then discusses health issues and was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark** for discussion of the number of hospital admissions. This is synthesised with evidence from France and the adverse effects of increasing the age and was awarded **1 analysis mark**. The candidate comes to a decision about the drinking age and was awarded **1 conclusion/decision mark**.

The candidate was awarded **2 evaluation marks**. They have clearly exceeded the 2 marks for each source evaluation. They have written enough detail for 6 marks.

Under their conclusion heading the candidate confirms their recommendation. **1 conclusion/decision mark** was awarded for an outline of the key reason that

alcohol consumption is already decreasing. A further **1 conclusion/decision mark** was awarded for explaining the rejection of option 1, increasing the legal age. A further **1 conclusion/decision mark** was awarded for rejecting option 3. Finally, in the last paragraph the candidate considers other potential options such as education and the fact that MUP should be given time to work and was awarded **1 further conclusion/decision mark**.

Throughout this report the candidate was awarded **6 conclusion/decision marks**.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for structure as they have:

- ◆ used headings and sections where appropriate to organise information
- ◆ used an appropriate report style
- ◆ referred to evidence used, including research evidence and background knowledge of issue
- ◆ showed consistency, coherence and logic of argument

This candidate has produced an excellent report and exceeds the maximum mark allocation in every section. Please be aware that full marks can be awarded for less comprehensive responses.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 30 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 10 marks
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 10 marks
- C: Source evaluation: 2 marks
- D: Structure: 4 marks
- E: Reaching a decision: 4 marks

Candidate 3

Title: Solving the NHS crisis

The candidate attempts to frame the issue in the introduction, but it is confused in places. However, they make a valid point regarding people living longer and a rise in obesity levels and other sorts of lifestyle related issues - **1 framing knowledge and understanding (KU) mark** awarded. The comment 'Although ...best in the world.' was not evidenced and anecdotal so was not awarded any marks.

Under the Solution 1 heading the candidate puts forward an argument and counter argument for increasing the availability of private healthcare/insurance as a potential solution. There is no reference made to source material despite "worried well" being quoted. However, **1 KU in support of analysis mark awarded** was awarded for reference to the middle classes taking up most hospital time.

1 KU in support of analysis mark awarded for poor not being able to afford healthcare and more likely to suffer ill health.

1 further KU in support of analysis mark for reference made to life expectancy figures in Glasgow and having a much higher rate of illness than rest of UK.

1 mark conclusion/decision was awarded for comment in final sentence.

Under the Solution 2 heading the candidate was awarded **2 source analysis marks** for reference to levels of obesity of men and women and overall spend (£6.5b) and linking these figures to, and justifying, solution 2. The source wasn't explicitly referenced but figures came from Source G on the research sheet.

In the 'against Solution 2' section, the candidate makes reference to poorer people being more likely to suffer from lifestyle related illnesses and therefore not likely to be able to pay for treatment. This was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**.

In the Solution 3 section, the candidate asserts that the public would be more likely to fund NHS and was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark** for the sentences that follow, to the end of paragraph. The candidate references Source G in relation to UK's ageing population, which is then linked to justification against this option, that it won't solve the problem, **1 analysis mark** awarded.

The candidate gives a conclusion which is justified in some depth. There are two reasons given but no argument or justification of the rejection of the other options. **2 conclusion/decision marks** awarded.

In terms of source evaluation, the candidate references the Guardian and particularly the fact that it contained information from both sides of arguments and was a balanced useful source. However, this wasn't in enough detail to gain any credit.

No marks were awarded for reference to a blog which does not appear on the research sheet.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for structure as they have:

- ◆ used headings and sections where appropriate to organise information
- ◆ used an appropriate report style
- ◆ referred to evidence used, including research evidence and background knowledge of issue
- ◆ showed consistency, coherence and logic of argument

Overall, the candidate was awarded 16 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 6 marks
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 3 marks
- C: Source evaluation: 0 marks
- D: Structure: 4 marks
- E: Reaching a decision: 3 marks

Candidate 4

Title: US immigration

The candidate introduces and frames the issue and gives a basic outline of the three options to be considered. The candidate was awarded **2 framing knowledge and understanding (KU) marks** for a range of statistics. No further marks were awarded but this may contribute to the report like structure of the response.

Under the Option 1 heading the candidate explains what they mean by Option 1 but there are no marks awarded for this. The candidate then tries to comment on how serious a problem illegal immigration is, but this section is too confused to gain any marks. The statistics used are not entirely accurate, **1 KU in support of analysis mark** awarded.

Further down in this paragraph, the candidate references and quotes from a US media source: 'In June 2017 ...'. This introduces an argument for Option 1, ie 'viral outbreak'. This is then further explained in the following lines. As the ABC source is not included on the research sheet, **1 KU in support of analysis mark** was awarded here. The candidate then backs this with a second quote from ABC. The explanation which follows is essentially a repeat of the one given immediately before and is awarded no further marks. The argument which follows in the next few lines of the paragraph that disease might lead to a less secure border, is logical and factual, and so was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**.

In the third last line of the page: 'However ...', the candidate provides an argument (using source A) against option 1. They use the figure 310,531 appropriately and they were awarded **1 analysis mark**. They then go on to argue that this proves that attempts to stop people entering the country are successful, but the figure is for apprehensions at the border and not for 'entering the country' as claimed so no further marks were awarded.

No further marks were awarded for the lines following this as the confusion between apprehensions and those entering the country continues.

The rest of the paragraph is not awarded any marks for appropriate reference to an Instagram survey (not on research sheets) as primary research must be evidenced on the candidate's research sheets.

Under the Option 2 heading the candidate explains what they see as the purpose of an 'amnesty' would be. The argument does not gain any marks as it suggests that immigrants who are granted citizenship and then commit a crime would be deported. This is not logical as they would already be US citizens.

In the lines which follow from 'Currently 800,000...country' the candidate quotes the statistic and explains why this type of partial amnesty would be good – **1 KU in support of analysis mark** awarded. In the remainder of the paragraph the candidate again refers to the survey which isn't on their research sheet and gains

no marks for this. They then make reference to the success of President Trump. Although written awkwardly, the last four lines of this section were awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**.

Under the Option 3 heading **1 framing KU mark** was awarded for knowledge of a guest worker programme and the industries it would affect. The reference to a system from the 1940's to the 1960's was not awarded any marks.

1 KU in support of analysis mark was awarded for information on the Canadian programme and why it could work in the USA. No marks were awarded for analysis of why the size of the US would stop a similar programme working there.

No marks were awarded for another use of the survey (not on research sheet) with the inclusion of evaluative language (massive).

In the final six lines of this section the issue of guest workers rights is raised, and mention is made of a plan to improve these. This section was awarded **1 KU in support of analysis mark**.

In the conclusion the decision is stated (though there are no marks for this alone) and is supported briefly in the first four lines of this paragraph. **1 decision/conclusion mark** awarded.

The next few lines provide an argument against the decision but was awarded no marks.

The final four lines provide an evaluation of the survey referred to in the report, however, as this isn't on the research sheet it gains no marks.

Two structure marks were awarded for: structure headings and sections and report style.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 12 out of 30 for their assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: 8 marks

B: Analysing and synthesising: 1 mark

C: Source evaluation: 0 marks

D: Structure: 2 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 1 mark

The candidate achieves 3 knowledge (framing) marks and 7 knowledge (in support of analysis) marks. As each type of knowledge mark is capped at a maximum of 5, the total for this response is 8 knowledge marks.