Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this question.

The candidate makes a valid conclusion on the negative impact on education, however, in isolation this gains no marks. The candidate goes on to use Source A to support their conclusion ("children…their family"). They then back this up using evidence from Source C ("a large number…regularly"). The first nine lines of the paragraph are awarded **2 marks** for the appropriate linking of two sources to support the conclusion. The last sentence of the paragraph is a repeat of the conclusion, so no marks were awarded for this.

The candidate makes another valid conclusion on employment which is an economic factor. In isolation this gains no marks. The candidate goes on to use evidence from Source A which talks about "prime of working lives" which gains **1 mark**. The candidate tries to use Source B but this does not support the conclusion as it contains no comparison, gaining no further marks.

The third conclusion states Africa has been 'pretty' successful. This is a valid conclusion but in isolation, it gains no marks. The candidate uses evidence from Source A, "many people…medication" gaining **1 mark**. The candidate tries to use Sources B and C to support this, but the evidence is not linked and does no show success, so no further marks were awarded. The '33%' statistic used, refers to global figures and is not specifically about Africa, so this did not gain any marks.

The overall conclusion makes no judgement and does not include evidence, so no marks were awarded.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this question.

In the first paragraph the candidate agrees that Portugal's approach to drugs policy is effective and backs it up with Source A ie "the number of…decreased" (lines 3 and 4 of the paragraph) – **1 mark** awarded. The supporting evidence (Source B) is used correctly so **1 mark** is awarded.

In the second paragraph the candidate opposes Portugal's approach using Source A – comparing Singapore and Portugal's heroin usage. This gains **1 mark**. The supporting evidence is from Source B and the use of 'only' allows

the candidate to gain **1 mark** as it shows both a comparison and evaluative judgement have been made.

In the next two paragraphs the candidate attempts to come to an overall judgement, but they fail to make a quantitative judgement and do not answer the 'to what extent' part of the question. Such 'absolute' answers are worth no marks. If a quantitative judgement had been included, then the evidence from Source A may have been creditworthy but the evidence from Source C was slightly mis-interpreted.

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this question.

In the first paragraph the statement on reliability (of Source A) is wrong so no marks were awarded (ie it is reliable as its purpose is to inform). However, the second judgement on reliability due to being scientists who are 'professionals' is accurate and gains **1 mark**.

In the second paragraph the candidate makes a comment on the date (for Source B), but it is vague and brief and does not recognise that information from three years ago is out of date, so no marks were awarded. Comments on the date of a source must be much more specific in their explanation or reliability. The second judgement on reliability is that YouGov is a 'professional polling organisation'. This is valid and was awarded **1 mark**.

The first four lines of the third paragraph are a little confused and do not gain any marks. The second half of the paragraph does not justify clearly enough why being old is a problem for reliability, so no marks were awarded.

No valid overall judgement was provided.

Overall, this candidate was awarded **10/28 marks** for this question paper.

Candidate 2

Question 3

This candidate was awarded **7 marks** for this question.

From 'Source A is mostly reliable' to 'accurate statistics' on line 8 of the paragraph, the candidate gained **1 mark** for their explanation that 'multiple people' will have been involved creating reliability. They gained no marks for 'Source A also has 7 pieces of evidence… alcohol in Scotland'. This point was too vague and was not awarded any marks.

From the start of the next paragraph to 'likely correct and accurate' on line 7 of the paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 mark**. They correctly refer to You Gov as highly respected.

From 'Source B is a results chart' until the end of the paragraph, the candidate gained a further **1 mark**. They correctly comment on importance of a large sample.

In the next paragraph from 'Source C is somewhat realiable' until 'are most likely accurate', the candidate is awarded **1 mark**. They correctly refer to ONS as a well-respected and reputable statistics 'company' (although not a company, the answer is credit worthy).

From 'However source could be' until the end of the paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 mark**. They correctly comment on and explain why being adapted reduces reliability.

The overall decision section was awarded **1 mark** for the comparison between Source B and Source A, which includes a valid justification.

The final paragraph was also worthy of **1 mark** as the candidate correctly compares Source B and Source C and provides a valid justification.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **9 marks** for this question.

The candidate's first short paragraph contains a valid conclusion. In isolation this gains no marks. In the next short paragraph beginning, 'This can be backed up' the candidate is awarded **1 mark** for using evidence from Source A to make their point. This pattern is repeated in the next paragraph, this time using evidence from Source C and the candidate was awarded **1 mark.** The candidate is awarded another **1 mark** for the rest of the paragraph for their evaluative comment using 'significant' and 'long term'

The third paragraph beginning, 'One conclusion that can be made' contains a valid conclusion. In isolation this gains no marks. The next short paragraph is awarded **1 mark** for the appropriate use of Source A evidence. In the next

paragraph beginning, 'This can be backed up with evidence from Source C' the candidate gains **1 mark** for the appropriate use of Source C evidence. From 'This shows that the economy' until the bottom of the page the candidate attempts to evaluate/synthesise the evidence from Sources A and C to demonstrate the economic impact on Africa. This gains **1 mark.**

The paragraph beginning, 'One conclusion' which finishes with, 'people who have HIV/Aids' contains a valid conclusion. In isolation this gains no marks. The next paragraph of this conclusion was awarded **1 mark** for the appropriate use of evidence from Source A. The final paragraph on this page was not awarded any marks as Source B is incorrectly used to show success. This is not shown in the table**.**

From 'One conclusion can be made' until 'Eswatini is that country' is a valid conclusion. The part about trying to improve is not valid and was not awarded any marks.

From 'This is backed up with evidence from Source B' until 'with HIV at almost 27%', **2 marks** were awarded. Evaluative terminology is used, and comparative statistics quoted appropriately to prove their argument

The candidate had already achieved full credit for their overall conclusion. However, the rest of the response would not have attracted any more marks as the evidence used from Source B does not back up the overall conclusion. The final short paragraph is repetitive and added nothing further to the answer.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** for this question.

From 'It is accurate' until 'having a "positive impact"' in the first paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 mark.** The candidate correctly uses Source A to show accuracy.

From 'This can be further backed' until 'improve their life' (in paragraphs 2 and 3) the candidate was awarded **1 mark**. This time the candidate correctly uses Source C to show accuracy.

In paragraph 4 the candidate says, 'It is accurate to state…'. This was also awarded **1 mark**. The candidate uses evidence from Source A to show accuracy.

Paragraph 5 begins 'It is inaccurate' and was worth **1 mark** as the candidate makes an evaluative comment about Singapore's policy.

Paragraph 6 begins, 'This is backed up with evidence from Source A' and was awarded **1 mark** for correctly using comparative evidence to back up their previous point.

Information given in paragraph 7 is a repeat from earlier in the response and incorrectly uses a statistic from Source B and, as a result, it was awarded 0 marks.

The first three lines of paragraph 8 contain a valid overall conclusion which makes a quantitative judgement (ie mainly accurate) This opens up the 2 marks available but in isolation without evidence, it gains no marks.

From 'Even though Singapore' to 'cannabis use' is awarded **1 mark** as the candidate shows evidence to indicate that there is some inaccuracy. Finally, in the remainder of the paragraph another **1 mark** was awarded. This provided evidence to show that the candidate still believes the policy is 'mainly' accurate and can therefore be considered more important.

Overall, this candidate was awarded **23/28 marks** for this question paper.

Candidate 3

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** for this question.

The first underlined conclusion is valid, using the evaluative judgement 'hugely negative'. However, on its own, without supporting source evidence, this did not gain any marks.

The quote used from Source A and the supporting evidence from Source C (in the first nine lines of the opening paragraph) were awarded **2 marks.**

The use of statistics from Source B was accurate and sophisticated – **1 mark** awarded. This would have been worth 2 marks but the candidate had reached the maximum mark (ie 3 marks) for a single conclusion**.**

The second underlined conclusion was valid, using the evaluative judgement 'significantly negatively' and singled out Lesotho as being particularly affected. On its own, without supporting source evidence, this was not awarded any marks.

1 mark was awarded for the use of Source A. The remainder of the paragraph was awarded **2 marks** for the complex use of the statistics in Source B. The final section of the conclusion 2 paragraph which uses Source C evidence, would also have merited a mark but the candidate was capped at 3 marks for this conclusion.

The third underlined conclusion is valid, using the evaluative judgement 'significant'. On its own, without supporting source evidence, this did not gain any marks.

1 mark was awarded for the use of Source A. No marks were awarded for the use of Source C as the 33% statistic refers to global trends and not specifically to Africa.

The use of Source B in the remainder of the paragraph gained **1 mark** for the use of statistics concerning ART.

The overall conclusion was awarded **2 marks**. It identifies Eswatini as the worst affected country (on its own not worthy of credit) and supports this with the correct use of statistics with evaluative comment. The final part of the answer gains no marks as it does not support the overall conclusion.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** for this question.

1 mark was awarded for the correct use of Source A: 'the number …improved' on lines 1 to 3 of the paragraph.

The use of the statistics from Source B was slightly misinterpreted but makes a valid enough argument to gain **1 mark** by saying that Portugal's drug death rate was 'significantly lower'. The statistics are not percentages and would not have been credited on their own. The remainder of the paragraph was awarded **1 mark** for the appropriate use of Source A evidence.

In paragraph 2, **1 mark** was awarded from the start of the paragraph to the end of the page. The candidate makes a valid point from Source C, concerning Portuguese prisons, which also supports the view.

In paragraph 3 ('Evidence against the statement') **1 mark** was awarded for the use of Source A in the first four lines of the paragraph. **1 mark** was awarded for the use of figures on 15–64-year-olds from Source B. A further **1 mark** was awarded for the use of the 5.8% statistic on cannabis use and the comment that this is 'high'.

The comparison of figures from Source C was awarded **1 mark**.

The candidate's overall judgement was awarded **2 marks** for the quantitative comment ie 'largely', plus appropriate justification from the sources.

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** for this question.

1 mark was awarded (in paragraph 1) for the argument that University research would be 'peer reviewed and held accountable'. No marks were awarded for the rest of this section as the answer was very subjective.

1 mark was awarded (in paragraph 2) for the comprehensive explanation that the link allowed the reader to check, and **1 mark** was awarded for the claim that YouGov is internationally recognised and this creates reliability.

1 mark was awarded for the out-of-date explanation (relating to Source C), ie the figures will have changed by now. **1 mark** was also awarded for the explanation that the ONS is independent.

The candidate states in their final paragraph that Source B is the most reliable. **1 mark** was awarded for the decision that B was more reliable than C due to the adaptation of C, and the explanation of this. No marks were awarded for the final paragraph which argues that B was more reliable than A.

Overall, this candidate was awarded **26/28 marks** for this question paper.

Candidate 4

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this question.

The initial conclusion at the start is not valid as it is a repeat of the bullet point without an evaluative comment. This means the evidence provided from Source A, in order to support this conclusion does not gain any marks.

An acceptable conclusion comes at the end of the paragraph, ie 'effected as bad as people may think'. Evidence from Source B using the Eswatini primary school completion rate and comparisons to state it is the 'lowest' of the six countries, can be linked to this conclusion and so gained **1 mark.**

The second conclusion follows the pattern of the first conclusion. The evidence provided does not gain any marks as the conclusion is not valid.

The third conclusion is valid as the candidate makes a judgement on success. Evidence from Source A in the last six lines of the page gains **1 mark**. Evidence from Source B on the next page of the response, from 'Eswatini' to 'getting help' also gains **1 mark**.

The evidence from Source C used at the end of this paragraph gains no marks as this statistic refers to global death rates.

The candidate's overall conclusion that Lesotho is the most affected country is a valid conclusion. The candidate uses Source B statistics showing Lesotho has lowest life expectancy at 54. This gained **1 mark**.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **7 marks** for this question.

In paragraph 1 (evidence to oppose) the candidate uses Source B on cannabis usage and gains **1 mark**. This is then backed up by Source B's heroin figures, gaining a further **1 mark**. The figures from Source C were interpreted incorrectly.

In paragraph 2 the candidate uses Source A correctly from 'Portugal's' until 'improved' – **1 mark** awarded.

In the remainder of the paragraph the candidate highlights evidence from Source B using the drop in deaths within Portugal and interpreting the figures correctly and is awarded **1 mark.** The statement that Portugal is the lowest is incorrect, but the evaluative comment and judgements in the paragraph were awarded a further **1 mark**.

In the next paragraph, further evidence from Source A is provided and from 'Portugal' on line 2 down to 'in world' on the second last line of the page, **1 mark** was awarded. The candidate then uses Source C and from 'decriminalisation' until the end of the paragraph, **1 mark** was gained.

Overall, no quantitative judgement was made, so 0 marks were awarded.

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** for this question.

The candidate provides an evaluative judgement relating to Source A, ie 'small extent'. They state that no date is given so the information may be 'out of date' – **1 mark** was awarded for this, and **1 mark** was awarded for 'well-respected and reputable organisation'.

In the paragraph relating to Source B no marks were awarded for 'date' as the explanation was weak and 2019 isn't 'current'. **1 mark** was awarded for the point about having a reputation to protect as they are a 'professional polling organisation'. Also, **1 mark** was awarded for the reference to 'wide range' in the sample size.

In the paragraph relating to Source C **1 mark** was awarded for the detailed explanation of why the date may be unreliable. The second point that the ONS is reliable because it is trusted is too vague and does not gain any marks.

The overall comparison of dates is valid so **1 mark** was awarded. The first part of the overall conclusion is confused so no mark was awarded.

Overall, this candidate was awarded **17/28 marks** for this question paper.