

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this Course Assessment component.

Evidence for Question 1 (a) (i)

Candidate 1

- ◆ One mark awarded for relatively weak description of 'exports of textiles'.
- ◆ No second mark awarded – reference to article considered too weak.

Candidate 2

- ◆ No mark awarded for description (use of 'exports' as a description of exports unacceptable).
- ◆ No mark awarded for weak reference to the article.

Candidate 3

- ◆ One mark awarded for description.
- ◆ One mark awarded for 'lift' from the passage exemplifying a numerical example of exports.

Evidence for Question 1 (a) (ii)

Candidate 1

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of effect on Balance of Payments.
- ◆ No second mark awarded as repetitive and doesn't actually refer to an increase in trade in goods.

Candidate 4

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of effect on Balance of Payments.
- ◆ One development mark awarded.

Evidence for Question 1 (a) (iii)

Candidate 5

- ◆ One mark awarded for reference to affording more currency.
- ◆ One mark awarded for imports cheaper/exports dearer – both are given by the candidate, but this is a 'flip'.
- ◆ One mark awarded for reference to Balance of Payments deficit.

Candidate 1

- ◆ Exactly the same marks awarded as for Candidate 5, but less concisely presented.
- ◆ Note that only one mark was available for imports cheaper/exports dearer – both are given by this candidate, but this is a ‘flip’.

Evidence for Question 1 (b)**Candidate 1**

- ◆ One mark awarded for explanation of benefits of specialisation: ‘increase productivity’ is the identification (ID) part which is then explained (EXP) with ‘specialise in a job that they can become efficient in’.
- ◆ One mark awarded for further explanation of productivity improvements using the same (ID), but in addition referring to ‘puts workers through education and training’ (EXP).

Candidate 2

- ◆ No mark awarded for ‘increasing advertising’ as this would increase costs and the candidate does not refer to a more than proportionate increase in revenue.
- ◆ One mark awarded for ‘new technology’ (ID) ‘reduce their costs’ (EXP). (This is a more valid response than the first attempt as there is implicit understanding of improvements in productivity.)

Evidence for Question 1 (c) (i)**Candidate 2**

- ◆ One mark awarded for definition.
- ◆ No further mark awarded due to the imprecise terminology used by this candidate in describing inelastic/elastic demand – eg ‘won’t be very responsive’, ‘very responsive’ – must see reference to proportionate changes.

Candidate 6

- ◆ One mark awarded for definition.
- ◆ One mark awarded for formula.

Evidence for Question 1 (c) (ii)**Candidate 2**

- ◆ Two marks awarded for the diagram: inelastic demand curve (1); fully labelled diagram (1).
- ◆ No third mark awarded for the diagram as revenue lost/gained not clearly labelled.
- ◆ No mark awarded for first sentence of explanation as ‘increase in the price’ and ‘demand being inelastic’ are in the stem, therefore the increase in revenue (ID) was not explained.

- ◆ No mark awarded for second sentence of explanation as imprecise terminology failed to convey adequately that the loss in quantity demanded is proportionately less than the increase in price.

Candidate 4

- ◆ One mark awarded for the diagram: inelastic demand curve (1).
- ◆ No second mark awarded for the diagram as not fully labelled.
- ◆ No third mark awarded for the diagram as revenue lost/gained not clearly labelled.
- ◆ One mark awarded for the explanation – although the language was still imprecise, it was clearly explained that the change in prices was ‘greater than the change in quantity demanded.’

Evidence for Question 1 (d)

Candidate 2

- ◆ One mark awarded for increase in income tax.
- ◆ One mark awarded for increase in VAT.
- ◆ No marks awarded for discussion of regional variations.

Candidate 6

- ◆ One mark awarded for increase in income tax.
- ◆ One mark awarded for increase in VAT.
- ◆ One mark awarded for development regarding impact on budget deficit.

Evidence for Question 1 (e)

Candidate 1

- ◆ No marks awarded as this candidate failed to describe any effects on the market (demand or supply) for Scottish clothing.

Candidate 2

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of the effect on demand for Scottish clothing.

Candidate 3

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of the effect on demand for Scottish clothing.
- ◆ One mark awarded for impact on equilibrium price in the market.

Evidence for Question 1 (f)

Candidate 1

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of how subsidies improve competitiveness.
- ◆ One mark awarded for description of how a soft loan could improve competitiveness.
- ◆ Note – no marks awarded for the descriptions of subsidy/soft loan.

Candidate 2

- ◆ One mark awarded for description of how subsidies improve competitiveness.
- ◆ One mark awarded for description of how a soft loan could improve competitiveness.
- ◆ No further marks awarded as no other ways of improving competitiveness were described.