

# Commentary on candidate evidence

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

## Candidate 1

**Title: Why are there different numbers of pedestrians and traffic in the inner city and the CBD of Dundee?**

**Section A: describing two research methods used to collect information about the topic or issue**

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The first technique mark was awarded for RICEPOT survey (**1 mark**) with a further mark awarded for the location of the surveys (**1 mark**). Another mark was awarded for the classifications used (**1 mark**). A further mark was awarded for the idea of RICEPOTS enabling comparison between land use and pedestrian numbers (**1 mark**). The second technique mark was awarded for the questionnaire (**1 mark**), and a final mark was awarded for the list of questions asked in the questionnaire (**1 mark**).

**Section B: describing and explaining, with reference to Processed Information, findings about the topic or issue, and reaching a well-supported conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **14 marks**.

The first descriptive mark was awarded for the highest number of vans found in the inner city at 17 (**1 mark**). The second descriptive mark was awarded for the CBD only having 8 (**1 mark**). The third descriptive mark was awarded for cars being the highest number of vehicles in the inner city (**1 mark**). The candidate has now reached the maximum number of marks available for descriptive points however, a further 9 descriptive marks could have been awarded in the remainder of the assignment, had they been required.

The first explanatory mark was awarded for the idea that there are more vans in the inner city as corner shops are small and require more frequent deliveries (**1 mark**). A further explanatory mark was awarded for the idea that there are less deliveries made later in the day in the CBD (**1 mark**). Another explanatory mark was awarded for the inner city having a high number of cars as there are more parking places because it is a residential area (**1 mark**). Another explanatory mark is awarded for the idea that more people get a bus to work in the CBD due to high parking costs (**1 mark**). An explanatory mark is awarded for the idea that there are many cars in the inner city heading to the CBD for work (**1 mark**), and a further explanatory mark is awarded for high order shops in the CBD attracting a

high volume of pedestrians (**1 mark**). Another explanatory mark was awarded for the high number of bus stops and train stations in the CBD contributing to the high volume of pedestrians (**1 mark**). A further explanatory mark was awarded for more people living in the inner city due to lower rents (**1 mark**). Another explanatory mark was awarded for many people living in the inner city as the CBD is easily accessible for work (**1 mark**). A further explanatory mark is awarded for the idea that there are many houses in the inner city due to them being built for factory workers in the past (**1 mark**), and a further explanatory mark was awarded for pedestrians being attracted to the CBD for commercial reasons (**1 mark**). The next sentence is a repeat point therefore, no marks were awarded.

The final sentence could have been awarded an explanatory/concluding mark for the idea that there are a large number of commercial buildings in the CBD as a large volume of people create more business, had it been needed.

**The candidate was awarded a total of 20/20 marks.**

## Candidate 2

**Title: To investigate the differences in housing conditions within Mumbai.**

**Section A: describing two research methods used to collect information about the topic or issue**

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The first technique mark was awarded for naming the report read for research (**1 mark**). No marks were awarded for reliability as this point is questionable since it is from 2009 and therefore, out of date. Technique two was awarded one mark for naming the source used; TV programme (**1 mark**). A mark was awarded for interviewed people to get opinions and views (**1 mark**), and another mark was awarded for information about how the programme visually shows conditions (**1 mark**). The fifth mark was awarded for the report being up to date (**1 mark**).

**Section B: describing and explaining, with reference to Processed Information, findings about the topic or issue, and reaching a well-supported conclusion**

The candidate was awarded **14 marks**.

The first descriptive mark was given for reference to Dharavi being the biggest slum in India (**1 mark**). The second descriptive mark was awarded at 'squatter camps' (evidence of knowledge gained from the video) (**1 mark**). The third descriptive mark was awarded for describing slum conditions 'sticks and poles' (**1 mark**). The candidate has now reached the maximum number of marks available for descriptive points.

The first explanatory mark was awarded for explaining effect poor housing conditions has on people 'down to rainy season' (**1 mark**). If they had been needed, further descriptive marks could have been awarded for 'basic needs such as water', 'shelters...crammed together', 'environment...bushes + dirt' and for the description of the building: '27 storeys'.

The second explanation mark was awarded for 'improvements by government'. Another descriptive mark (if needed) could have been awarded for 'land not approved by government' and a further 2 descriptive marks (if needed) could have been awarded in next paragraph.

The third explanatory mark was awarded for the effect of living conditions in people (fatal) (**1 mark**). A further two explanatory marks were awarded for effects of housing; 'treated right away' (**1 mark**), and for crowded areas being the reason for spreading disease (**1 mark**).

Explanation marks 6 and 7 were awarded for the consequences of buildings being close together (**2 marks**), and explanatory mark 8 was awarded for the effect of no rubbish on children (**1 mark**).

Further descriptive marks (if needed) could have been awarded for the conditions in slums, and for describing the environment where children are free to play. A further explanation mark was awarded for 'unsanitary conditions' (**1 mark**).

Explanatory mark 10 was awarded for dangers to human health from contaminated water (**1 mark**) and explanatory mark 11 was awarded at the end of the paragraph for the effects burst pipes have on health (**1 mark**).

In the next paragraph, up to 4 more descriptive points could have been awarded (if needed) for availability of running water; '24 hours' and what they use their water for. Another descriptive mark could have been awarded at the first line of next page (if needed), and a further 2 descriptive marks could have been awarded for life expectancy at 60 and at 40 (if needed).

In the final paragraph, an explanatory mark was awarded for the basic conclusion (**1 mark**).

**The candidate was awarded a total of 19/20 marks.**