

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of question paper 2.

Candidate 1

Question 1

The candidate makes one accurate point of comparison about age. The candidate also develops this point of comparison with an analytical comment.

The candidate also compares the sources on the point of social class, with an appropriate analytical comment. They then make a point of comparison about the message but although their comment is about leadership, it was considered creditworthy due to the inclusion of the fault of the Conservatives securing them the win as the public do not trust them.

They then provide a detailed overall conclusion.

The candidate is awarded 8 out of 8 marks for this question.

Question 2

Component 1

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote), Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then successfully synthesises.

The candidate then provides evaluation, albeit the justification for this is given above however there is reference to the House, the Senate and the Electoral College.

The candidate is awarded 4 out of 4 marks for component 1.

Component 2

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote), Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then successfully synthesises.

The candidate then provides an evaluation with justification and evidence.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 2.

Component 3

The candidate fails to identify accurate data on Aspect 1 (women) but does manage to correctly identify Aspect 2 (non-white).

They then synthesise the data accurately.

For evaluation, they make an attempt however, they do not identify enough years for women so they are not using enough of the data.

The candidate is awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for component 3.

Component 4

The candidate correctly identifies both Aspect 1 (Democrats) and Aspect 2 (Republicans).

The candidate does however successfully synthesise as they talk about the 'Senate and the House, the Democrats saw....'

The evaluation has justification and evidence.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 4.

Component 5

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (cabinet level), Aspect 2 (national legislature) and Aspect 3 (heads of state).

The candidate then attempts to synthesise the aspects across their response, however they only synthesise one aspect, so it is not creditworthy.

The evaluation has justification.

The candidate is awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for component 5.

The candidate is awarded 17 out of 20 marks for this question.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 25 out of 28 marks for the question paper.

Candidate 2

Question 1

The candidate compares the sources on age and gives an accurate comparison. They have also given an analytical comment.

The candidate makes one accurate comparison about social class. The candidate also provides an analytical comment.

The candidate compares the sources on leadership and gives an accurate comparison. They have also given an analytical comment.

The candidate makes an overall conclusion about the two sources, which they justify with evidence.

The candidate is awarded 8 out of 8 marks for this question.

Question 2

Component 1

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote). They also correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then provides synthesis “this shows in all 4 sections”.

The candidate then evaluates; however this is not creditworthy as it does not provide enough clear justification.

The candidate is awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for component 1.

Component 3

The candidate fails to correctly identify Aspect 1 (women) but correctly interprets Aspect 2 (non-white).

There is synthesis given when they say “also this shows there has been a decline in female members....”

The candidate fails to give clear evaluation of the statement.

The candidate is awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for component 3.

Component 4

The candidate manages to correctly identify both Aspect 1 (Democrats) and Aspect 2 (Republicans).

The candidate provides some synthesis where they say “from their party, but the Republican party hasn’t”.

No creditworthy evaluation.

The candidate is awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for component 4.

Component 5

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (cabinet level) and Aspect 2 (national legislature) but fails to correctly identify Aspect 3 (heads of state).

The candidate provides synthesis “of women in the cabinet and in the National Legislature”.

They attempt to evaluate however this is not creditworthy as the candidate says that the statement was completely accurate and it was not.

The candidate is awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for component 5.

Component 2

The candidate fails to correctly identify Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote) But they manage to correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House)

No marks given for synthesis.

No creditworthy evaluation given.

The candidate is awarded **1 out of 4 marks** for component 2.

The candidate is awarded 11 out of 20 marks for this question.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 19 out of 28 marks for the question paper.

Candidate 3

Question 1

The candidate makes one accurate point of comparison about social class. The candidate also develops this point of comparison with an analytical comment.

The candidate compares the sources on age and gives an accurate comparison. They have also given an analytical comment.

The candidate compares the sources on leadership and gives an accurate comparison. They have also given an analytical comment.

The candidate makes an overall conclusion about the two sources, which they then successfully justify with evidence.

The candidate is awarded 8 out of 8 marks for this question.

Question 2

Component 1

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote). They also correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then synthesises the aspects across their response.

The candidate then successfully evaluates with justification.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 1.

Component 2

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote). They fail to correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote) but do get both Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then synthesises the aspects across their response.

The candidate then tries to provide an evaluation however it is incorrect.

The candidate is awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for component 2.

Component 3

The candidate identifies Aspect 1 (non-white) but does not pick up on the “continuous”. They also do not correctly identify Aspect 2 (women) in relation to continuous.

There is no accurate synthesis or evaluation of the statement.

The candidate is awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for component 3.

Component 4

The candidate does not correctly identify either Aspect 1 (Democrats) or Aspect 2 (Republicans).

The candidate not successfully synthesise or evaluate the viewpoint as they have interpreted the wrong data from the sources.

The candidate is awarded **0 out of 4 marks** for component 4.

Component 5

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (cabinet level), Aspect 2 (national legislature) and Aspect 3 (heads of state).

The candidate then synthesises the aspects across their response.

They attempt to evaluate and this was credited as they talk about ‘which means that the US does not do significantly better than other American nations....’

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 5.

The candidate is awarded 10 out of 20 marks for this question.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 18 out of 28 marks for the question paper.

Candidate 4

Question 1

The candidate makes one accurate point of comparison about leadership. The candidate also develops this point of comparison with an analytical comment.

The candidate makes a comparison about social class with an analytical comment.

The candidate then makes a comparison about age with an analytical comment.

The candidate then makes a justified overall conclusion which deals with the three key influences.

The candidate is awarded 8 out of 8 marks for this question.

Question 2

Component 1

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote). They also correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then synthesises 'through all 4 measurements'.

Evaluation then given with evidence.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 1.

Component 2

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (Electoral College vote). They also correctly identify Aspect 2 (% of popular vote), Aspect 3 (Senate) and Aspect 4 (House).

The candidate then provides synthesis the aspects.

The candidate then provides an evaluation with supporting justification.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 2.

Component 3

The candidate correctly identifies 1 Aspect (non-white) and they also identify the second aspect (women).

Synthesis given 'whilst the number....'

There is no accurate evaluation of the statement as it does not deal with the 'highest ever' part of the statement.

The candidate is awarded **3 out of 4 marks** for component 3.

Component 4

The candidate correctly identifies both Aspect 1 (Democrats) and Aspect 2 (Republicans).

The candidate provides synthesis where they say "whilst the no. of women....."

They then evaluate the viewpoint with justification.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for component 4.

Component 5

The candidate correctly identifies Aspect 1 (cabinet level) but fails to identify Aspect 2 (national legislature) or Aspect 3 (heads of state).

No synthesis or evaluation.

The candidate is awarded **1 out of 4 marks** for component 5.

The candidate is awarded 16 out of 20 marks for this question.

Overall, the candidate was awarded 24 out of 28 marks for the question paper.