

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** for this question.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for giving a correct conclusion regarding minimum unit pricing (MUP) and crime rates which was backed up with one correct piece of evidence from Source A regarding an increase in theft of strong alcohol.

They were awarded a further **2 marks** for the second conclusion regarding MUP and health, which was backed up with one piece of evidence from Source B and one piece of evidence from Source A, with an attempt to synthesise this evidence at the end of that specific paragraph.

A further **2 marks** were awarded for a correct overall conclusion regarding changes to drinking habits following MUP, with evidence given from Source A regarding consumption levels as well as evidence from Source C about comparisons between drinking habits between men and women.

Question 2

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

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for the section on evidence to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons being successful. The candidate references Source A which is backed up with further evidence, again from Source A, which is synthesized with an evaluative comment. This is further reinforced with evidence from Source B. The final sentence from this paragraph is used to make an overall evaluative comment about what this evidence highlights with regards to effectiveness of the threat posed by nuclear weapons.

The section on efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons was awarded **2 marks** due to the use of evidence from Source B and for the evaluative comment that accompanies the use of this evidence.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** in the final paragraph of their answer for use of the phrase 'mostly accurate' and the use of Source A evidence to back this up.

Question 3

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

The candidate made reference to Source B and its reliability as a source with the comment 'the campaign mostly favours the UK leaving the EU'. **(1 mark)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for their overall evaluation of which source was the most reliable: 'Source C was the least reliable source as the information may not have been fact checked ... most relevant'.

Candidate 2

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** for this question because they gave three correct conclusions and an overall conclusion which were all properly justified with evidence from the three sources.

For the first conclusion, the candidate backed up their conclusion with evidence from Source C. This was then synthesised and reinforced with evidence from Source A which was then followed with a correct comment in relation to how the evidence justifies the conclusion. **(3 marks)**

The second conclusion regarding the introduction of MUP and crime was properly justified with evidence from Source B which is backed up with further evidence from the same source. The candidate makes very good use of statistical evidence to justify their second conclusion. **(2 marks)**

The third conclusion was awarded **3 marks** as it was a correct conclusion – no marks were awarded for the conclusion but source use justification is credited – and was backed up with relevant evidence from Source B. This was then reinforced with evidence from Source B. Source A was then further used to justify the original conclusion.

The overall conclusion was awarded **2 marks** as it used evidence from Source A and Source C to draw and justify a conclusion regarding people's drinking habits.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** for this question because the candidate showed detailed evidence both for and against a view regarding the effectiveness of the threat of nuclear weapons deterrent. They also produced an overall comment as to the accuracy of the statement.

In paragraph 1 the candidate was awarded **4 marks**. They provide evidence from Source A which supports the view that the threat of nuclear weapons has decreased in recent years. This is backed up by statistical evidence in Source B regarding the decrease in the number of nuclear weapons **(2 marks)**. These pieces of source evidence are then further reinforced with Source A information about the USA and Russia meeting their START targets. The paragraph ends with this information being synthesised to highlight that this evidence all shows that the nuclear threat has been reduced **(2 marks)**.

In paragraph 2, the candidate was awarded **4 marks** for showing that the threat of nuclear weapons had continued to rise. Evidence has been produced and effectively synthesized from Source A (countries building a nuclear stockpile) and Source B (three countries developing nuclear weapons). There is also further evidence from Source B (increase in number of nuclear warheads since 1965)

with further justification from Source B which references the threat from US President in relation to North Korea.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for the final paragraph because they have given an overall comment with regards to the statement being 'largely accurate' with two pieces of evidence from Source A and Source B used to justify this comment.

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for this question because they made effective judgements on the reliability of each individual source as well as commenting on which source(s) were the most and least reliable in a final overall judgement.

In paragraph 1, the candidate assessed Source A as being very reliable as it is published by a reputable polling company that included a large representative sample size. **(2 marks)**

For Source B, the candidate assessed the source as being very unreliable as it may have been out of date due to date of publication (2016) and that it came from a potentially 'biased' and 'one-sided' campaign group. **(2 marks)**

For Source C, the candidate made the judgement that it was 'fairly' reliable as it was recent (2017) but had data that appeared to be 'misleading' because of the manner in which it was presented. **(2 marks)**

For an overall assessment of comparative reliability, the candidate was awarded **2 marks** as they commented on which source was the most reliable as well as which source was the least reliable and evidence was presented to justify these opinions.

Candidate 3

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they made an attempt to make and justify conclusions with regards to the impact of Minimum Unit Pricing (MUP).

The first conclusion regarding MUP and crime was awarded **2 marks** for evidence from Source A about a small decrease in serious crimes backed up with evidence with regards to projected crimes rates between 2013 and 2023. This information tends to add weight to the conclusion that MUP has had 'little impact' upon crime.

The second conclusion was awarded **2 marks** for reference to Source A evidence about average drinkers who 'live in poverty' backed up evidence from Source C about decrease in consumption in Social groups C2DE. Both points of evidence confirm the candidate's conclusion that MUP has led to a decrease in consumption for those in poverty.

The final conclusion was also awarded **2 marks** for reference to Source B evidence about Alcohol Related Hospitalisations (ARH) which is backed up with Source A evidence about MUP looking 'positive for the future'. These two pieces of evidence confirm the candidate's conclusion about MUP impacting ARH.

No credit was given for the overall conclusion as the conclusion is not correct. MUP is having an impact.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because they have successfully managed to provide evidence both in support of and against the view that 'efforts to reduce the threats posed by nuclear weapons have been successful.'

The evidence to support this view was awarded **4 marks** as they referred to, and provided evidence from, Source B in relation to the number of nuclear warheads being 'drastically reduced'. This is then backed up with evidence from Source A with regards to countries being committed to a process of 'de-nuclearisation'. The candidate has also produced further evidence from Source A (public opinion poll) synthesized with figures from Source B which shows the decrease in number of nuclear warheads between 1985 and 2017.

The evidence presented by the candidate which opposes the view was awarded **4 marks** as they introduced evidence from Source A with regards to nuclear weapons still remaining a threat, coupled with Source B information which focused on North Korea launching 23 missiles. The candidate also produced further evidence from Source B (Donald Trump's threat to 'totally destroy' North Korea) as well as using evidence from Source A that referenced opinion poll findings.

No marks were awarded for the overall conclusion as the candidate did not make a valid conclusion and did not produce any specific source evidence.

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the candidate made some valid comments about the reliability of the three sources.

For Source A, the candidate was awarded **1 mark** for the comment that it can be trusted due to it being a 'well known and trusted' polling company. The second comment about sample size was wrong and therefore did not receive any credit.

For Source B, the candidate was awarded **1 mark** for it being unreliable and biased and for discussion about the money being spent on the NHS. The second comment on page 12 added no value to this overall mark allocation.

For Source C, the candidate was awarded **2 marks** for reference to the source being unreliable. These marks were awarded for the candidate stating that the Source could mislead voters due to the manipulation of the statistics and for reference to the particular statistics from the Source

A final **1 mark** was awarded for the overall comment that Source A is the most reliable and the justification provided.

Candidate 4

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Question 1

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they made an attempt at justifying three conclusions.

For the first conclusion, they were awarded **2 marks** for evidence which supported the conclusion that MUP is likely to reduce consumption of alcohol in social classes CDE rather than AB. They produce evidence from Source A about consumption level of drinkers in poverty backed up with evidence from Source C comparing consumption between the different social classes.

For the conclusion regarding alcohol related hospitalisations, the candidate gained **2 marks** for the reference to Source A and 'Binge Drinking is a major cause of hospitalisations' and a link to evidence in Source B which mentions that the predicted number of alcohol-related hospitalisations.

The final conclusion regarding alcohol consumption and criminal activity was awarded **2 marks**. The candidate uses evidence from Source A with percentage of alcohol offences from young offenders. This is then synthesised with evidence from Source B about the predicted decrease in the number of alcohol-related violent crimes.

The overall conclusion is merely a restating of the other conclusions and does not gain any marks.

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for use of source evidence from Source A which states that countries such as China, France etc have all committed to reduce their number of nuclear weapons. They also use Source B to back up this point with reference to the increase in the stockpile in North Korea and then link to a detailed justification, 'This shows that although effort has been made by some countries it has been unsuccessful in creating a nuclear free world.'

The candidate in the following paragraph, ('Overall, this is...') merely restates the information from the previous paragraph and is not credited for this.

Question 3

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

In discussion of Source A, the candidate was awarded **2 marks** for reference to it being reliable as it was produced by a 'well known and trusted' polling company and that it can be seen to be out of date as it is two years old.

In discussion of Source B, the candidate was awarded **1 mark** for reference to the source promoting, 'One agenda' thus indicating that it may be biased. The discussion of 'fact-checking' was not awarded any marks.

In discussion of Source C, the candidate was awarded **1 mark** for reference to the fact that it was produced by a 'biased' political organisation.

The overall judgement was awarded **2 marks** for stating and justifying Source A as the most reliable and for the comment that Sources B and C 'promote a political agenda' and that Source A is the least biased.