

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for these candidates has achieved the following marks for the specified questions of the question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 2

Interpretation of data linked to the first part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate identifies the first component of the first part of the viewpoint in a quote on the first page of their response. The candidate then goes on to accurately interpret the information in source A as victories for the Democrats relating to both the popular vote and the Electoral College vote. The candidate then interprets the information in source B for the results in 2012 for both the Senate and the House of Representatives. This part of their response was unduly vague and the candidate could have communicated the loss of the House to the Republicans. They were credited with interpretation (as opposed to mere description) due to comments immediately following and preceding their description.

Therefore, as the candidate correctly interprets three aspects of data, they were awarded **2 marks**.

Synthesis: The candidate does not attempt synthesis until after they interpret component 2. At the foot of the first page of their response and on to the second page, they provide a synthesis integrated with evaluation of both components of the first part of the view point. On the second page of their response they make a link between the performance of the Democrats across all three levels (erroneously referring to the House as Congress but still differentiating this from the Senate).

As the candidate links all identified aspects of data, they were awarded **1 mark** for synthesis.

Component 2

Interpretation: The candidate identifies the second component of this part of the viewpoint in a further quote on the first page of their response. They interpret information across all three aspects of data (Presidency, House and Senate) and identify differences between the performance of the Democrats in 2012 and 2008.

As the candidate interprets all three aspects of data, they are awarded **2 marks**.

Synthesis: On the second page of their response, the candidate attempts to synthesise information on the performance of the Democrats. However, they do not accurately link information across levels between 2012 and 2008 (instead attempting to link to 2010).

As the candidate does not link all identified aspects of data they were awarded no mark for synthesis.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks for interpreting** and **1 mark for synthesis**.

Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint

Evaluation of first part of the viewpoint

Component 1: On the second page of their response the candidate provides an accurate evaluation of the validity of this component. The candidate clearly addresses both the issue of 'convincingly defeated at every level' and also 'the Democrats clearly won the 2012 elections'. They provide supporting evidence for both.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for evaluating the first component of the first part of the viewpoint with supporting justification.

Component 2: The candidate provides an evaluative comment relating to the 2012 result being almost as impressive. A weak justification is provided, but as they have provided supporting justification they are credited for this.

The candidate was awarded a further **1 mark** for evaluating the second component of the first part of the viewpoint.

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for evaluation.

Overall, this candidate was **awarded 7 out of 8 marks** for their response to the first part of the viewpoint.

Candidate 2

Question 2

Interpretation of data linked to the first part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate's response is confusing as they initially appear to contrast the presidential information in 2012 with 2008. They do, however, go on to relate the information in source A to the first component and identify the Presidential election Electoral College gap. The information on the popular vote is confused, but as the candidate then goes on to link this to the 2012 election they are given credit for the interpretation of the first aspect of data (Presidential election). There is no reference to the Senate and House performance.

As the candidate interprets only one aspect of data, they were awarded **1 mark**.

Synthesis: There is no synthesis of data as the candidate does not address more than one aspect

The candidate is awarded no marks for synthesis.

Component 2

Interpretation: The candidate identifies the second component of this part of the viewpoint in their opening comments on the second component at the foot of the second page of their response.

On the third page, the candidate then goes on to accurately interpret and link information from source B. The candidate addresses the performance in the Senate and interprets this accurately by indicating both the contrasting number of gains between 2008 and 2012 and that the Democrats have four fewer senators in 2012 than in 2008. The candidate goes on to accurately make similar comparisons for the results in the House of Representatives. However, there is no reference to the performance at the Presidential levels.

As the candidate interprets only two aspects of data, they are awarded only **1 mark**.

Synthesis: During the course of their response, the candidate attempts to link the two identified aspects and indicate that the performance in the House of Representatives 'was even less impressive' than that of the Senate.

As the candidate links all their identified aspects of data, they were awarded **1 mark** for synthesis.

For the first part of the viewpoint the candidate was awarded **3 marks** (1 mark each for interpretation of data for each of the two components, and 1 mark for synthesis of information for the second component).

Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint

Evaluation of first part of the viewpoint

Component 1: On the second page of their response to this question the candidate links the information on the performance at the presidential level to provide an evaluation of part of the first component, as they evaluate how convincing the performance of the Democrats was in 2012 with supporting justification. However, there is no evaluation of the remaining part of this component (ie 'at every level') therefore, this is only partial and therefore no marks were awarded.

The candidate is awarded no marks for evaluation of the first component of the first part of the viewpoint.

Component 2: In the first paragraph on the third page of their response, the candidate integrates the interpretation and synthesis of data to support an accurate evaluation of the second component of the first part of the viewpoint. They indicate that in the Senate the performance in 2012 was 'no where near 2008 standards' and for the House the net loss of seats was 'more embarrassing than impressive'.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for evaluating the second component of the first part of the viewpoint.

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for evaluative comments with supporting justifications for the first part of the viewpoint.

The candidate provided a series of evaluative comments through their response. Other candidates may provide an extended summative evaluation that addresses all comments of the viewpoint. Full credit can be given for either approach.

Overall, this candidate was awarded **4 out of 8 marks** for their responses to the first part of the viewpoint.

Candidate 3

Question 1

Analysis – identification of relevant points of comparison

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because three accurate points of comparison are made relating to:

- ◆ The social contract – paragraph 1
- ◆ Power and role of the state – paragraph 2
- ◆ The state of nature – paragraph 3

Analysis – comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because an analytical/evaluative comment is made on each of the three points of comparison:

Disagreement is identified on the nature of the social contract. For Hobbes it is between people only, but for Locke the state is part of the contract.

Differences identified about how much power the state requires. On one hand the state requires unlimited power to prevent anarchy, on the other the state should have powers limited to protect natural rights.

Both positions agree that government is required to provide security and order.

Overall conclusion

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because a detailed overall conclusion in paragraph 4 is made, highlighting fundamental differences regarding the proper role of the state, but agreeing that some form of state power is required.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **8 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Candidate 4

Question 1

Analysis – identification of relevant points of comparison

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because two accurate points of comparison are made relating to:

- ◆ The social contract – paragraph 2
- ◆ The state of nature – paragraph 3

No marks were awarded for an inaccurate point of comparison attempted between Hobbes' argument for obligation to a dominant state and Locke's support for parliament against the monarchy (paragraph 1).

Analysis – comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because an analytical/evaluative comment is made on two points of comparison:

Disagreement identified on the nature of the social contract – for Hobbes it is between people only, but for Locke the state is part of the contract (paragraph 2).

Differences identified about how much power the state requires. On one hand the state requires unlimited power to prevent anarchy, on the other the state should have powers limited (paragraph 3).

No marks are awarded for the first paragraph as this is not a relevant point of comparison

Overall conclusion

The candidate was awarded **1 mark** because a straightforward overall conclusion in paragraph 4 is made highlighting that there are large differences regarding the proper role of the state based on supporting comparison of the evidence.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **5 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Candidate 5

Question 1

Analysis – identification of relevant points of comparison

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because three accurate points of comparison are made relating to:

- ◆ The role and power of the state – paragraph 1
- ◆ The measures required to escape a state of nature – paragraph 2
- ◆ Human nature – paragraph 3

Analysis – comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because an analytical/evaluative comment is made on two points of comparison:

Agreement identified on the need for source of power to avoid a state of nature (paragraph 2).

The extent of the differences identified on human nature and its impact on the role of the state (paragraph 3).

No marks are awarded for the first paragraph as this merely restates the comparison and makes no further comment that, for example, identifies the extent of the disagreement or source of the differences.

Overall conclusion

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because a detailed, overall conclusion in paragraph 4 is made linking insightful comments on the respective positions on human nature and examining the implications of these.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **7 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Candidate 6

Question 1

Analysis – identification of relevant points of comparison

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because three accurate points of comparison are made relating to:

- ◆ The power of the state – paragraph 1
- ◆ The role of the state – paragraph 2
- ◆ The obligation to obey the state – paragraph 3

Analysis – comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because an analytical/evaluative comment is made on three points of comparison:

Implications of the extent of the power of the state are identified and contrasted (paragraph 1).

Contrasting implications for obligations to obey the state are identified (paragraph 2).

Disagreements between liberal and conservative positions are identified and explained (paragraph 3).

Overall, the candidate is awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for analysis.