Candidate 6

Total marks awarded – 25/30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of assessment</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research methods (gathering techniques 1 and 2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to/use of processed information</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent is Edinburgh a clone town?

Page 1
The first KU mark was awarded at ‘and business centre’ (1 mark) and a second KU mark was awarded at ‘theatres and clubs’ (1 mark) for the development of background knowledge of the CBD. Both of these marks are for lists of information; although it is succinctly written, they contain multiple pieces of information. A further KU mark is awarded at ‘or home town’ for further relevant knowledge of the topic (1 mark). A T2 mark is awarded at ‘determining a clone town’; this becomes apparent later in the study (1 mark). When marking an assignment, it is helpful to read through the whole report before marking as this helps to put ideas into context and marks can be awarded appropriately.

Page 2
On the first line, the phrase ‘high retail diversity index score’ is underlined (a low score is a clone street rather than high) and again, an underline is placed at ‘highest index weighting’. An ‘R’ is placed at the end of the paragraph for a reverse point. An underline is placed at ‘local jobs’ as new shops will potentially create jobs, but a KU mark is awarded at ‘and communities’ for an explanation of the development of clone towns (1 mark). A carat is placed at ‘smaller shops to occur’ as this is poorly expressed but is credited later when the candidate makes the point more clearly. A further KU mark is awarded at ‘expanded a bit’ for reference to urban models and the longevity of the location of Edinburgh’s CBD (1 mark).

Page 3
A T1 mark is awarded at ‘score for each street’ for a description of a shop survey (1 mark). A further T1 mark is awarded at ‘given different results’. Although this is the defined method for surveying clone towns, the candidate is making an attempt to evaluate this method (1 mark). No marks are awarded for the further evaluation of available categories. As this is a shopping survey, other non-shopping services/business should not be included.

A T2 mark is awarded at ‘10 people’ for a description of the questionnaire (timing and number of participants) (1 mark).
Page 4
A third T2 mark is awarded at ‘times in the day’ for a limited explanation and a limited evaluation of the methodology (1 mark).
A further T2 mark is awarded at ‘to the questions’ for further limited development and limited evaluation of this technique (1 mark).

A carat is placed at ‘not everyone wanted to stop’. There is limited evaluation here, but not enough for a mark and the candidate has already gained a mark for opinions on page 1.

Analysis: A PI mark is awarded at ‘13 and 14’ for data from the PI sheets with interpretation (three times plus data) (1 mark). A Con mark is awarded at ‘Edinburgh is a clone town’ for this statement and the second sentence in this paragraph (1 mark). This is an example of a point being potentially a conclusion or a PI.

Page 5
An underline is placed at ‘28%’ on the second line because this should be 36%.
A carat is placed at ‘25 categories’ as this is not enough for a PI mark. A carat is also placed at ‘bid-rent theory’ as this is not expanded, but it is credited later.

A PI mark is awarded at ‘and 60 respectively’ for a trend (15%) with figures to back this up (1 mark). A mark is not awarded for the next section because the candidate is arguing that a high EQI is due to chain stores, however their EQI graph contradicts this showing that Rose St is higher. A PI mark is awarded at ‘the total score of 69’ for interpretation of the EQI graph (1 mark).

Page 6
An AN mark is awarded at ‘National Gallery’ for an explanation of the high EQI greenery score (1 mark). A PI mark is awarded at ‘183 respectively’ for identification of a trend (a third) and figures to support this (1 mark). An AN mark is awarded at ‘to chain brands’ as the candidate has analysed why Rose St is not a clone street (1 mark).

A KU mark is awarded at ‘for land in this area’ for an explanation of the bid-rent theory (1 mark). An AN mark is awarded at ‘survive on these streets’ for an explanation for independents locating outwith the CBD (1 mark).

Page 7
A carat is placed at ‘11 and 9’ as this is too basic, however, it can be (and is) rolled together with the carat from page 5 (number of shops in a category) and a PI mark is awarded here (1 mark). A further PI mark is awarded at ‘is a border town’ for average score and an application of a category (of border town) to Edinburgh (1 mark). The candidate has now reached the maximum of 6 marks for KU however further marks could have been awarded as follows. A PI mark is awarded at ‘9 and 8’ for trend (four times) and supporting data (1 mark). An ‘R’ is placed at ‘heritage of the street’ as this was already credited for Rose St on page 6.

Page 8
A conclusion mark was awarded at ‘ancient building style’ linking with ‘not an extreme example’ on line 3 for a conclusion on why Edinburgh is not a true clone town (1 mark).

Two marks were awarded for communicating information (2 marks); the report is well structured and uses appropriate terminology for this topic.