

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

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

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 their opening comments on the first page of their response. This candidate then goes on to accurately interpret the information in source A relating to both the popular vote and the electoral college vote. The candidate then goes on to correctly interpret the information in source B for the results in 2012 for both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

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

Synthesis: On the second page of their response the candidate synthesises the information by bringing together their interpretation of all three aspects of data. In their response they argue that the performance of the Democrats in the electoral college was more convincing than in the popular vote and contrasting that although they won the senate, they did not win the House of Representatives.

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 their opening comments on the third page of their response. The candidate then goes on to accurately interpret and link information from both sources A and B. (For example the decline in the share of the popular vote, the electoral college vote, the reduction in the number of Senators in the House of Representatives and the less impressive gains).

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

Synthesis: Towards the end of the first paragraph on the fourth page of their response the candidate makes an explicit comment synthesising all the information and identifying that every single one of the measures align.

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

Interpretation of data linked to the second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate identifies both the first and second component of the second part of the viewpoint in their opening comments in the second paragraph on the fourth page of their response. The candidate then goes on to accurately interpret the information in source C relating to both the performance of the individual candidates in different regions and across different communities, and goes on to link this to the issue identified in first component of this part of the viewpoint (area).

As the candidate interprets all two aspects of data, they were awarded **2 marks**.

Synthesis: In the first paragraph on page five, the candidate explicitly links the performance of Obama across regions and communities and also goes on to make further comparative comments comparing his performance in big cities to the Midwest.

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

Component 2

Interpretation: The candidate then moves on to accurately interpret information on gender, age income and ethnicity using source D and links this to the second component of this part of the viewpoint (pages five and six of the candidate response.)

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

Synthesis: On the fifth and sixth page of their response, the candidate links the variability of the performance of Obama across the different aspects of data (for example by indicating that the trend for gender is also the case for age and that, in addition, income also indicates that Obama won some groups but not all groups in each category). The candidate then goes a step further and makes a comment explicitly linking the performance of Obama across all aspects of data (for example by noting he only won females, the young, low incomes and minorities).

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

Component 3

Interpretation: At the start of the first paragraph on the seventh page of their response the candidate identifies the third component of this part of the viewpoint. The candidate then, on the last two pages of their response, moves on to accurately interpret information on gender, age income and ethnicity by comparing the performance of Trump in source E with that of Romney in source D. They link this to the third component of this part of the viewpoint.

As the candidate interprets all four aspects of data they were awarded **2 marks**.

Synthesis: On the final page of their response, the candidate synthesises information from all four aspects of data included in sources D and E (for example identifying that Trump lost votes among women, whites, and specific age and income groups). The candidate also establishes patterns across different aspects of data (for example by identifying that variability in Trump's performance across income is in addition to variability of his performance across ethnicity).

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

Overall the candidate was awarded **10 marks for interpreting data** and **5 marks for synthesising** aspects of data across all components of both parts of the viewpoint.

Evaluation of extent of validity of viewpoint

Evaluation of first part of the viewpoint

Component 1

On the second page of their response this candidate integrates their synthesis of information on the three aspects of data (Presidential, Senate and House of Representatives) with their evaluation of the viewpoint. They address the issues of clearly winning, convincingly defeating at every level with supporting justification (for example by noting the closeness of the popular vote and that fact that despite winning both the Presidency and Senate, the Democrats lost the House to the Republicans).

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

Component 2

In the first paragraph on the fourth page of their response, the candidate directly addresses the issue of how impressive the performance of the Democrats was in 2012 compared to 2008. The candidate uses their synthesis of the data to accurately evaluate this part of the viewpoint and supports this by comparing 2012 unfavourably to 2008 (for example by pointing out majorities have been reduced and by every measure the Democrats performance was worse).

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

Evaluation of the second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

On the fifth page of their response this candidate makes use of their synthesis of information on the two aspects of data (Region and Community) with their

evaluation of the viewpoint. They directly evaluate the viewpoint and address both the validity of the comments on decisive margins and every area, (for example by noting the closeness of the margin in some areas and the fact that Romney beat Obama in areas such as the south and rural areas). The candidate was awarded **1 mark** for evaluating the first component of the second part of the viewpoint with supporting justification.

Component 2

Towards the foot of the sixth page of their response, the candidate directly evaluates this part of the viewpoint and addresses both the issue of Obama's performance across all areas and how decisive his margins were. The candidate supports this with evidence based on the correct interpretation and synthesis of information.

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

Component 3

Towards the foot of their response, the candidate directly evaluates this part of the viewpoint and addresses the issue of Trump performing significantly better than Romney among all voter groups. The candidate supports this with evidence, pointing out that in some categories Trump performed only marginally better than Romney (not significantly) and that in some categories Romney actually performed better than Trump so Trump did not even perform better across all groups.

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

The candidate was awarded **5 marks for evaluative comments** with supporting justifications.

This 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 to either approach.

Overall this candidate was **awarded 20/20** for their response to this question.

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 2

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

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 their opening comments on the first page of their response. This candidate then, on the first and second pages of their response, goes on to accurately interpret the information in source A relating to both the popular vote and the electoral college vote. The candidate then goes on to interpret the information in source B for the results in 2012 for both the Senate and the House of Representatives. However, this interpretation is not linked to the first component (ie if the Democrats defeated the Republicans in 2012) as the candidate attempts to compare gains made by the two parties in 2012 compared to their performance in 2008. This does not address the issue of 'did the Democrats defeat the Republicans?', therefore it cannot be accepted as interpretation of data linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint. Thus, only one aspect of data is interpreted accurately (the data on the Presidential election in 2012).

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

Synthesis: On the second and third page of their response, the candidate attempts to synthesise the information by bringing together their own interpretation of all three aspects of data (Presidential, House and Senate). As they are attempting to synthesise all their identified aspects of data, they are credited for this.

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 their opening comments on the third and fourth pages of their response. The candidate then goes on to accurately interpret and link information from both sources A and B. (For example, the decline in the share of the popular vote, the electoral college vote, the less impressive gains in both the House and the Senate).

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

Synthesis: On the fifth page of their response, the candidate makes an explicit comment synthesising all the information from the Presidential, Senate and House elections and then identifies that the Democrats performed better in 2008 than 2012 in every single area.

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

Interpretation of data linked to the second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate identifies the first component of the second part of the viewpoint in their opening comments in the paragraph starting at the foot of the sixth page of their response. The candidate then goes on to accurately interpret the information in source C relating to both the performance of the individual candidates in different regions and across different communities.

As the candidate interprets all two aspects of data they were awarded **2 marks**.

Synthesis: On page eight of their response, the candidate explicitly links variability of the performance of Obama across regions and communities. The candidate earlier on page seven also links the aspects of data to identify areas of strong support (both regions and communities) and also areas of strong support from Romney across both regions and areas.

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

Component 2

Interpretation: The candidate then identifies the second component of this part of the viewpoint and moves, on page nine and ten of their response to accurately interpret information on gender, age income and ethnicity using source D, and links this to the second component of this part of the viewpoint.

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

Synthesis: On the 10th page of their response, the candidate brings the information together on the performance of Obama to identify that he only won in about half of the categories. This synthesis of information is also evident in the candidate's supporting justification of the validity of this part of the viewpoint (page 11).

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

Component 3

Interpretation: On the 11th and 12th pages of their response, the candidate identifies the third component of this part of the viewpoint. However, the

candidate then appears to make use of data on Clinton which is not linked to this component (the performance of Trump compared to Romney). If they had developed this further this would not have gained further marks. As it stands the candidate does not progress further and no further credit is awarded.

As the candidate does not interpret any aspects of data they were not any awarded any marks.

Synthesis: no synthesis is attempted so no marks are awarded.

Overall the candidate was **awarded 7 marks for interpreting data** and **4 marks for synthesising** aspects of data across all components of both parts of the viewpoint.

Evaluation of extent of validity of viewpoint

Evaluation of first part of the viewpoint

Component 1

On the third page of their response this candidate provides an accurate evaluation on the validity of this component. Initially it does not appear that the candidate has provided supporting justification. However, by developing a line of argument in relation to the defeat on the House of Representatives and the narrow margin in the popular vote, they have provided justification. This line of argument leads them to their evaluation and thus meets the criteria for providing supporting justification

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

Component 2

At the foot of the fifth page and then onto the sixth page of their response the candidate provides an evaluation of this component, with supporting justification based on electoral college votes and also the performance in the House.

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

Evaluation of the second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

On the eighth page of their response this candidate makes use of their synthesis of information on the two aspects of data (Region and Community) and provides an accurate evaluation of the viewpoint. They directly evaluate the viewpoint and address both the validity of the comments on every area, (for example by noting the fact that Romney beat Obama in areas such as the south and rural areas) and the validity of comments on decisive margins (for example by noting the closeness of the result in the Midwest).

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

Component 2

On page eleven of their response, the candidate provides an accurate evaluation with supporting evidence (based on age, gender, ethnicity and income).

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

Component 3

No evaluation is provided so the candidate was not awarded any marks for evaluating the third component of the second part of the viewpoint.

The candidate was awarded **4 marks for evaluative comments** with supporting justifications.

This candidate provided a series on 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 to either approach.

Overall this candidate was **awarded 15/20** for their response to this question.

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 3

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

Question 2

Interpretation of data linked to the first part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate interprets information from source A and identifies the closeness of the Presidential popular vote margin in 2012 compared to the electoral college. The candidate then goes on to try to use information from source D to further support their argument regarding how convincingly the Democrats defeated the Republicans in 2012. However, there is no reference to performance of the two parties in the House or the Senate. Therefore, only one aspect of data is interpreted.

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

Synthesis: As there is no reference to the results for the Senate or the House of Representatives, the candidate is unable to demonstrate synthesis across all identified aspects of data.

As a result, they were awarded **0 marks** for synthesis.

Component 2

Interpretation: In the final paragraph on the first page of their response the candidate addresses the performance of the Democrats in 2012 compared to 2008. The candidate identifies that the popular vote share was higher in 2008 and the electoral college vote was considerably higher. On the second page the candidate appears to address the issue of the performance of the Democrats in the Senate and in the House. However, this interpretation is inaccurate. It appears the candidate is inaccurate in attributing gains to the Democrats and also in making comparisons of the data to 2010 and not 2008.

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

Synthesis: The candidate does attempt to link their three identified aspects of data and makes a direct comparison between the performance at the Presidential and Congressional results which is linked to this component (ie how impressive the results were). They have displayed an attempt at synthesising this information even though it was based on an inaccurate interpretation of data. Even though they have come to the wrong conclusions as a result, they have attempted to link the aspects of data based on their previous interpretation and

they should be credited with displaying the ability to link information. To fail to credit this would in effect double penalise the candidate for their previous erroneous interpretation.

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

Interpretation of data linked to the second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

Interpretation: The candidate attempts to address the second part of the viewpoint in the final paragraph on the second page of his response. The candidate appears to focus on areas but then goes onto interpret information from source D which is related to sections of society.

The candidate does go on to interpret information on gender, age, ethnicity and income but it is not linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint. This information is related to the second component. As outlined in the marking grid, the candidate unfortunately cannot be credited for this. The candidate does go on to address region and community in the bottom paragraph on the third page of their response. Although a weak interpretation, the candidate has identified that Obama did not perform as well in the south but also claims incorrectly that he did not perform as well in the west. The candidate does however identify that Obama performed poorly in towns and rural/suburban areas. The candidate then attempts to introduce information from source B which is irrelevant. The candidate has been credited with interpreting accurately the information on community but not region.

As the candidate interprets 1 aspects of data they were awarded **1 mark**.

Synthesis: As with the first part of the viewpoint, the candidate suffers from poor interpretation of data in their use of the sources. However, they again have attempted to link the data they have (erroneously) interpreted and this should be credited as displaying the skill of synthesising information. This again ensures the candidate is not double penalised for their earlier errors.

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

Component 2

Interpretation: The candidate has used the information on gender, age, ethnicity and income but has not related it to the second component of the viewpoint (all sections of society) therefore they cannot be credited with this as per the marking grid.

As the candidate has not interpreted data accurately for this part of the viewpoint they are awarded **0 marks**.

Synthesis: As this competence is not addressed by the candidate, they cannot be credited with synthesis of data linked to this component.

As the candidate does not address this component of the viewpoint they cannot be awarded any marks for synthesis.

Component 3

Interpretation: On the second last page of their response the candidate attempts to address the last component of the viewpoint. The candidate does not provide an interpretation of specific data (ie on gender, age, ethnicity or income) from either sources D or E, though they do provide a synthesis of information across the two sources. It may appear that this candidate addresses information on ethnicity, but they do so by comparing the performance of the Republicans to the Democrats, rather than comparing the performance of Trump to Romney.

As the candidate does not interpret any aspects of data, they are awarded **0 marks**.

Synthesis: The candidate does attempt to synthesise information across sources D and E and identifies that in some areas Trump improved on Romney's performance and in some areas Romney did better than Trump.

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

Overall the candidate was awarded **3 marks** for interpreting data and **3 marks** for synthesising aspects of data across all components of both parts of the viewpoint.

Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint

This candidate provided both evaluative comments throughout their response as well as an extended summative evaluation that addresses all comments of the viewpoint.

First part of the viewpoint

Component 1

On the first page of their response the candidate attempts an evaluation of this component, however, although they attempt to address the extent of how convincing the Democrats won, they do not address if this was at every level.

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for evaluating the first component of the first part of the viewpoint with supporting justification.

Component 2

In the first paragraph on the second page of their response the candidate directly addresses the issue of how impressive the performance of the Democrats was in

2012 compared to 2008. However, they provide an inaccurate evaluation due to their poor interpretation of the sources.

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for evaluating the second component of the first part of the viewpoint.

Second part of the viewpoint

Component 1

In the second paragraph on the second page of their response this candidate attempts to address the validity of the viewpoint and goes on to use information from the sources to support this. The candidate states in contrast to the viewpoint that there were many areas where Obama lacked support and then further goes on to indicate his failure to achieve decisive margins, with supporting evidence on the third page of their response. In the final paragraph of their response they further support the lack of a decisive margin in every area.

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

Component 2

The candidate does not identify nor address the second component of the first part of the viewpoint.

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** for evaluating the second component of the second part of the viewpoint.

Component 3

Towards the foot of their response on the second last page the candidate addresses the validity of this part of the viewpoint and via their synthesis of the information addresses the issue of Trump performing significantly better than Romney among all voter groups. The candidate further supports this in the last paragraph of their response.

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

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for evaluative comments with supporting justifications.

Overall this candidate was **awarded 8/20** for their response to this question.