

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Title: Smoking is one of the biggest causes of death and illness in the UK

In lines 1 to 4 of the introduction the candidate is awarded **1 framing knowledge and understanding (KU) mark** for the statistic '76,000 people die'. They then outline solution 1 and solution 2 that they intend to develop. They are awarded a further **1 framing KU mark** for saying that smoking causes 70% of different types of cancer on line 12. (This was accepted as a reference to lung cancer.) In the remainder of the paragraph a third option is mentioned, and the candidate describes some of the generic effects of smoking. This was awarded **1 framing KU mark**.

The last four lines in the introduction may have come from the candidate's source sheets but it does not contribute to their analysis; it is simply a statement of fact from the source and was not awarded any marks.

The candidate then starts to discuss their first solution – banning smoking. From line 3 to line 10 of this section, they refer to Source 3 and were awarded **1 analysis mark** for the basic argument that this would lead to a decrease in hospital admissions. The last section of the paragraph, from 'Additionally' to 'smoking (Source 4)' is vague and was not awarded any marks.

The first 11 lines of the next paragraph were awarded **1 analysis mark** for comments on the benefits of a ban and use of Source 5. In the last three lines of the paragraph, they refer to Source 6 but do not develop this or link it appropriately to their previous point. No further marks were awarded.

The candidate continues to discuss banning smoking at the top of the next page using Source 7 and was awarded **1 analysis mark**.

The candidate then starts to look at solution 2 – increasing the price of cigarettes and the legal smoking age.

In the first paragraph of this section, starting 'Another solution to smoking' the candidate refers to Source 8 and Source 11 but is too confused. No marks were awarded for this section.

The candidate continues to discuss the benefits of increasing the price and legal age of smoking. In lines 1 to 7 of the next paragraph, they discuss the impact on poorer communities, but this is too generic, and no marks were awarded. They

use Sources 12 and 13 but do not develop any relevant arguments. No marks were awarded.

In the second paragraph on this page, the candidate analyses Source 14 and is awarded **1 analysis mark**. Their analysis comes first, followed by an acceptable reference to the source.

The candidate then goes on to discuss their third solution – keeping everything the same. In the first paragraph of the section the candidate twice refers to Source 15 and gives a limited analysis. This was awarded **1 analysis mark**. The rest of the page is confused and repetitive, gaining no further marks.

The candidate does make a decision/reach a conclusion, that being that solution 2 is the most practical and they try to support this. However, it is confused and becomes irrelevant in places. (**1 decision/conclusion was mark awarded**).

The candidate refers to the BBC – **1 evaluation mark** was awarded for stating that journalists are 'qualified and experienced'. The references to the NHS were not detailed enough to merit a mark.

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- ◆ **1 mark** for headings and sections
- ◆ **1 mark** for report style
- ◆ **1 mark** for referencing and use of background knowledge

Overall, the candidate was awarded 13 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 3 marks
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 5 marks
- C: Source evaluation: 1 mark
- D: Structure: 3 marks
- E: Reaching a decision: 1 mark

Candidate 2

Title: Childhood obesity in the UK

The candidate begins by stating the three options to be considered. No marks are awarded for this.

In the introduction section (lines 1-3) the candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for demonstrating the scale of the problem. In the remainder of line 3 down to 'target for bullying', the candidate outlines some of the impacts of the issue and was awarded **1 framing KU mark**. Although some of this section has been lifted from Source A the explanation about children missing school was enough for a mark to be awarded. From this point down to line 9 of the introduction ('obesity in the UK'), the candidate was awarded **2 framing KU marks** for providing two pieces of knowledge and an explicit comment linking obesity to poverty.

From line 9, 'The government have tried' until line 12 of the introduction, the candidate describes the Soft Drinks Industry Levy and was awarded **1 framing KU mark**. In lines 12 to 16 (from 'The Sugar Tax' to 'does not work very effectively') the candidate assesses the success of the sugar tax, explaining that its failure means something else needs to be done. This was awarded **2 framing KU marks**. In the last five lines of the introduction the candidate re-states the alternative courses of action to be considered, so attracts no further credit.

This section was awarded the maximum 5 framing knowledge and understanding marks.

On the next page the candidate presents option 1 – Introducing a Fat Tax and initially gives arguments for this option. From line 1 of this section to the start of line 7, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for using the source material to demonstrate the possible impact of a 'Fat Tax' on consumers. From line 7 to the end of the paragraph, **1 analysis mark** was awarded as unemployment and ill-health are identified as impacts of obesity (also referencing Source A).

In the next paragraph the candidate presents arguments against this option. In the first six lines of this paragraph the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for developing the idea from Source B that a fat tax may be more difficult to implement than first thought. In lines 6-10, a further **1 analysis mark** was awarded for using Source C to argue that a fat tax may financially disadvantage poorer sections of society. **1 analysis mark** was awarded for lines 10-14 (from 'This means that' until 'with healthy ingredients') as the candidate develops this point further. In the last three lines of this paragraph the candidate summarises some of the earlier information by saying a fat tax is 'well effective' but this isn't justified enough to merit a decision mark.

The candidate moves on to discuss option 2 – Educate families on nutrition and healthy diet giving arguments for this option. The candidate combines Sources D and E and provides enough analysis of the source material to be awarded **2 analysis marks**.

Following this they look at arguments against this option. The candidate's use of the word 'majority' in line 2 of this paragraph and their initial use of their survey (in lines 1-3) is confused and does not gain any marks on its own. However, the further development of the point on lines 3-5 of the paragraph is awarded **1 analysis mark**. In lines 5-9 of the paragraph, **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the use of the survey in Source G. No further marks were awarded for the final three lines of the paragraph as no judgement or decision is made.

Under the next heading the candidate discusses option 3 – further restricting advertising on high fatty and high sugary foods.

In the first two lines of the section discussing arguments for this option, the candidate tries to provide some background exemplification. No further KU (framing) marks were awarded as the information is too generic. From 'From the current' to 'their parents for it' the candidate quotes a figure from Source H and comments on it – **1 analysis mark** was awarded.

From line 5 to line 8 ('In Source I ...reduce childhood obesity') **1 analysis mark** was awarded. In the last 5 lines of this paragraph the candidate brings in source material concerning Canada and comments on their success – **1 analysis mark** was awarded.

In lines 1-7 of the arguments against section, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the use of Source K and the comments regarding 'not very effective'. From line 7 to the end of the paragraph the candidate sums up the earlier points in the paragraph and does not make a definitive decision, gaining no further marks.

Under the candidate's conclusion heading **1 decision/conclusion mark** was awarded for a basic justification of the choice in lines 1-3. In lines 3-5, **1 decision/conclusion mark** was awarded for a basic rejection of educating families with evidence. In the rest of the section a reason for the rejection of option 3 was awarded **1 decision/conclusion mark**.

Under the source evaluation heading the candidate was awarded **1 evaluation mark** awarded for a valid point regarding survey size in paragraph.

In paragraph 2, **1 evaluation mark** was awarded for a valid point about the date of Sources A and B. The amount of detail provided in this paragraph regarding the events of recent years would have merited a second mark but the maximum allocation for this section had already been reached.

The candidate met all the criteria regarding structure and was awarded **4 structure marks**.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 24 out of 30 for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 5 marks*
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 10 marks*
- C: Source evaluation: 2 marks
- D: Structure: 4 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 3 marks

*The candidate exceeded the maximum marks available for framing KU and analysis.

Candidate 3

Title: Alcohol in Scotland

The candidate introduces their topic then discusses drinking habits in Scotland in lines 2-6 of the opening paragraph. This was awarded **2 framing KU marks**.

The candidate then discusses statistics relating to Glasgow – ‘To really put it into perspective in Glasgow ... 1413 hospital admissions’. This was awarded **1 framing KU mark**.

The candidate goes on to discuss alcohol deaths across Scotland. This was **awarded 1 framing KU mark**.

There is no attempt to introduce the options/solutions to be considered in the report.

Throughout the rest of the assignment the candidate references sources at the end of each paragraph. No KU marks can be awarded as the referencing of sources at the end of each paragraph suggests all evidence is from the research sheet.

The candidate begins by discussing option 1 – increase pricing. The candidate discusses Minimum Unit Pricing (MUP) and comments on the reduction of fatalities which was awarded **1 analysis mark**. From ‘In a PHS report’ to line 5 on the next page, the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for analysis of impact on sales following introduction of MUP. Lines 6-7 on the second page of the candidate’s response were not awarded any marks as this was a repeat of the analysis and no clear decision was made.

In the next paragraph (on page 2 of the candidate’s response) the candidate discusses the possible impact on the alcohol industry with all information attributed to Sources D, E and F. **1 analysis mark** is awarded at the end of the paragraph for the comment, ‘This will increase the amount ...negatively effected by the increase in pricing’.

In the next paragraph the candidate discusses the impact MUP has on people in poverty. **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the first two sentences of this paragraph. A further **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the last three lines of the paragraph (‘This unfortunately proves ...especially for those in poverty).

In the next paragraph the candidate discusses Hogmanay. This was not considered credit worthy and was awarded no marks. The candidate then discusses a survey. **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the judgement that an increase in pricing will be ineffective: ‘This clearly shows the enjoyment ...will be difficult to change’.

The candidate moves on to discuss option 2 – implementation of other countries’ policies. The candidate begins by discussing Norway and its selling laws. No marks were awarded for this initially as the information is a descriptive ‘lift’ from

Sources I, J and K. However, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the impact of the selling restrictions on alcohol consumption in Norway: 'It is very clear that all of the restrictions ... 7.4 litres per capita per year'.

In the next paragraph the candidate discusses Bangladesh and its alcohol ban. No marks were awarded from the start of the paragraph to the last line of the page as this information is credited to the sources and not developed as analysis at this point. The sentence that starts on the last line of this page, 'This proves that even though ... mostly successful' about the impact of the alcohol ban was awarded **1 analysis mark**.

In the next paragraph (on page 5 of the candidate's response) the candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for the three sentences beginning 'However, Norway's policies are not' and finishing 'doing the opposite'. A further **1 analysis mark** was awarded for discussion of the increase in alcohol consumption, from 'In 2011 alcohol consumption per capita was' until 'effective in Scotland?'. A further **1 analysis mark** was awarded for discussion of Bangladesh and the impact on health services in the remainder of the paragraph.

The candidate only discusses two options, however two countries within option 2 are discussed, in effect splitting option 2 and allowing the full 10 analysis marks to be awarded.

2 evaluation marks were awarded for discussion of the survey. The first two sentences were awarded 1 mark each. The last point about the response being from Scotland was not considered credit worthy.

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

The candidate was awarded **3 structure marks**. No mark was awarded for 'referring to evidence used' as the references provided were vague.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 20 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

- A: Knowledge and understanding: 4 marks
- B: Analysing and synthesising: 10 marks*
- C: Source evaluation: 2 marks
- D: Structure: 3 marks
- E: Reaching a decision: 1 mark

*The candidate exceeded the maximum marks available for for analysis.

Candidate 4

Title: Child poverty – ways to reduce this

The candidate opens with an introduction in which they try to frame the issue. The candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for their discussion of child poverty's definition and what someone experiencing child poverty may lack.

The candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for saying that low pay is one of the main drivers of child poverty. A further **1 framing KU mark** was awarded for the discussion of the impact of child poverty.

The candidate was awarded 1 framing KU mark for each of the following points:

- ◆ reference to social exclusion/bullying (**1 framing KU mark**)
- ◆ reference to 4.3 million and the enormity of the problem (**1 framing KU mark**)
- ◆ reference to the working poor and 71% (**1 framing KU mark**)
- ◆ discussion of the impact of child poverty on ethnic minorities (**1 framing KU mark**)

A final **2 framing KU marks** were awarded for the discussion of the comparison between Scotland and England.

This introduction achieved the available 5 KU marks for framing the issue/introduction.

The candidate then details their specific options/solutions and gives a recommendation which is followed up by detailed overview of both the arguments for and arguments against.

In the arguments for solution 1, the candidate was awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for reference to tired, emotional and unfocused and difficulty in retaining information. Another **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded for reference to 'nine months behind'. The candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for comparison between impact of free school meals on ability to learn following introduction of free school meals in the section 'However, Source A...' to 'learning outcomes.'

In the second paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for the reference to the saving of £450 a year with the introduction of free school meals. From 'If families are' to 'grow up healthy', **1 analysis mark** was awarded.

In the third paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for discussing the link between free school meals and child obesity rates. The candidate justifies this with source use. This point is developed through a comparison of free school meals and packed lunches and is backed up with analytical comment – **1 analysis mark** awarded. The candidate uses the information from Source C with regards to percentage of packed lunches that met

food standard regulations, but this was not credited in isolation as it was a straight lift from the source. However, the last three lines were awarded **1 analysis mark**.

The final paragraph was awarded **1 analysis mark** for reference to poor students missing out on meals.

The candidate then goes on to discuss solution 1 arguments against, with **1 analysis mark** awarded from the start of the paragraph to 'This does not determine that all children who receive them will earn less but is used as a wealth indication.' The last two sentences on independent schools were not entirely relevant to free school meals.

The candidate then goes on to discuss solution 2 argument for. The candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for the comment 'help a huge amount of children ...is already very high', and **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for reference to '93%.

In the second paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for reference to the impact of rising costs on middle income families. For reference to the impact of implementation, ('an increase would lift a huge amount out of poverty'), **1 analysis mark** was awarded.

The paragraph on arguments against solution 2 is partially incorrect and confusing. This paragraph was not awarded any marks.

In the first paragraph discussing arguments for solution 3, marks were awarded for the following:

- ◆ **1 analysis mark** for the comment on the impact of arriving late affecting attainment.
- ◆ **1 analysis mark** for the extension of this point prioritising the main reason for arriving late.
- ◆ **2 KU (in support of analysis) marks** were awarded for the reference to free bus access to travel and a comparison with the rest of the UK.

In the second paragraph of this section, marks were awarded for the following:

- ◆ **1 analysis mark** for the candidate's comment about uniform, 'heightens the feelings of social exclusion and embarrassment'.
- ◆ **1 analysis mark** for the candidate's comment that parents struggle having to purchase expensive uniform.

Arguments against solution 3 were awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)**. This was slightly anecdotal but was worthy of a mark.

Under the evaluation of sources heading no marks were awarded for the comment on Source D as it was too descriptive of CPAG's work. **1 evaluation**

mark was awarded for stating that Source A is outdated, and obesity rates may have changed since then.

Under the decision heading, **2 decision/conclusion marks** were awarded for the benefits of the policy choice. The first two sentences coupled with the final sentence meets the detailed criteria. **2 decision/conclusion marks** were awarded for the rejection of the other possible solutions considered.

The candidate met all four criteria for structure marks, so the full **4 marks** were awarded.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 29 out of 30 marks for their assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: 10 marks*

B: Analysing and synthesising: 10 marks*

C: Source evaluation: 1 mark

D: Structure: 4 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 4 marks

*The candidate exceeded the maximum marks available for KU and analysis.