

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for the Conclusion(s)/ Recommendation(s) (Section 4) of the assignment.

## Candidate 1

**Purpose: 'to investigate how might the introduction of tourist taxes impact an economy'**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for this section.

- **1 mark** for justified conclusion (negative impact on individuals > tourists cannot afford higher prices).
- **1 mark** for justified conclusion (negative impact on firms > loss of tourists and tourist spending).
- **1 mark** for justified conclusion (positive impact on government > revenue with which to improve infrastructure).
- **1 mark** for justified recommendation (introduce tourist tax > revenue can be spent on better infrastructure which encourages more tourists).

**General** - the candidate has chosen to split their conclusions by the impact on the 3 agents of the economy. This style ensures that the candidate has covered all aspects of the economy, in line with the purpose of the report.

## Candidate 2

**Purpose: 'to investigate the impact of an increase in the vaping and tobacco tax'**

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

- **1 mark** for justified conclusion (benefit economy > revenue can be spent on infrastructure, with examples).
- **0 marks** for conclusion (less people falling ill) as this is a repeat of a previous analysis point with no expansion.
- **0 marks** for conclusion (higher working population) as this is new information in this section.
- **0 marks** for conclusion (discourages younger generations) as this is a repeat of a previous analysis point with no expansion.
- **0 marks** for conclusion which is not justified (harder for smokers to quit ...).
- **1 mark** for justified recommendation (government help smokers to quit > it improves individuals' standard of living).
- **0 marks** for the recommendation to have dynamic pricing on vapes as it does not make a clear enough link to ill health caused by tobacco.
- **0 marks** for tighter restrictions on vapes and tobacco as the candidate does not specifically recommend them or give a reason for doing so.
- **0 marks** for people being more aware of the danger as the candidate has not previously mentioned rates of tax in relation to the level of danger of a product.