

## **Candidate 1 - That the American government should take action to get rid of guns in the United States of America.**

Candidate 1's Assignment has achieved the following marks for each aspect of the Coursework Assessment task.

The section headed 'Title' almost provides a conclusion or a general recommendation; however it is an acceptable topic.

The section headed 'Introduction' provides a clear decision or recommendation but fails to detail any alternatives to this.

In the section headed 'Recommendations' the candidate actually gives three arguments in favour of the decision but no actual recommendations. The first recommendation 'That guns means fewer deaths and more guns mean more deaths' is quite a confused heading. The candidate uses evidence from the research sheet about experiences in Australia, but this is also confused. It is also largely copied from Source 1 and only provides a very brief link to the topic. The suggestion is clearly that if gun control worked in Australia, it would also work in the USA. This was awarded **1 mark (analysis)**.

The next section headed 'Guns have an influence on suicide as it is much easier to act on impulse with a gun' is largely copied from the research sheets. However, it does make a point about possible reductions in suicide, including some manipulation of the figures. This section was awarded **1 mark (analysis)**.

The section headed 'Guns lead to school shootings' starts with 7 lines lifted directly from the source sheet so no marks are awarded. From line 7 to the end of this section the candidate gives a description of 'Sandyhook' and links this back to the argument in favour of the recommendation. This section was awarded **2 marks (knowledge)**.

The section headed 'Possible criticisms' gives very brief arguments against the decision. The section headed 'Suicides and guns have no relationship' is copied from Source 4 on the research sheets and is awarded no marks.

The next section about the 'second amendment' is confused and largely copied from the research sheets. However, the candidate has tried to add some analysis here by mentioning human rights and the conflict between the right to own a gun and the rights of victims. **1 mark (analysis)** awarded.

In the Evaluation of sources section, the first paragraph is vague and confused and is awarded no marks. The next two sentences where the candidate tries to evaluate two separate websites were also awarded no marks as they are vague, confused and inaccurate.

The candidate gives a clear conclusion / recommendation supported by a very brief justification, ie it is against US rights but the loss of life is much more important. This was awarded **1 mark (decision/conclusions)**.

The headings used by this candidate are largely confused and inappropriate with large chunks copied. The candidate is also quite informal and often uses the first person which detracts from the report style. The candidate has included limited, simplistic knowledge and understanding but much of the analysis is copied from the research sheets. **1 mark (structure)**.

<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Analysis/Synthesis</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Source Evaluation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Structure</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Decision</b>	<b>1</b>

**The candidate was awarded 7/30 marks for this Assignment.**