Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence achieves the following marks for each assignment.Candidate 1

Assignment title: Illegal immigration in the UK

Introduction

In lines 1-5 of the introduction, the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the comment ‘In the past couple of years there has been a rise in people from different countries trying to enter the UK illegally. This could be because of many reasons such as a war going on in their home country, looking for better opportunities or fleeing danger in their country.’

In lines 7-11, the candidate is awarded a further **1 framing KU mark** for ‘But some people arrive to the UK via France normally on small boats with zero documentation. This can in fact harm the environment and can harm people due to the unsafety of the little rubber boats. These boats are normally supplied by illegal trafficking gangs that would “help” people have a better life with a large cost.’

There are no other credit worthy points made within the introduction as the candidate simply lifts from their research sheet. The research sheet is not referenced and appears to be a plan.

Options

The candidate then starts to discuss their three options. In lines 6-8 they are awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the sentence starting ‘For example, the USA have decided’ until the end of the paragraph ‘illegal immigration stats.’

Option 1 – deploy more people along the border

In lines 1-2, the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the comment ‘In the UK, the main way people can illegally immigrate is to come on small boats and cross the English channel.’

There is nothing else creditworthy in the rest of option 1.

Option 2 – better border relations with France

The candidate starts to discuss their second option but there was nothing creditworthy in this paragraph.

Option 3 – advanced AI usage

The candidate starts to discuss their third option but there was nothing creditworthy in this paragraph.

Option 1 – arguments for

In this paragraph there is nothing creditworthy as the candidate makes a very confused and incorrect argument about unemployment.

Arguments against

In lines 1-4, the candidate is awarded **1 KU (in support of analysis) mark** for the comment ‘If the UK were to pick this option, there would be a large amount of money thrown into it for facilities, wages and the actual relocation of the immigrants and possibly the workers because they would need to live in a coastal town along the English which they may not already’.

Option 2 – arguments for

The candidate does not achieveany marks in this paragraph as their attempts at knowledge or analysis are vague and generic.

Arguments against

The candidate does not achieve any marks in this paragraph as their attempts at knowledge or analysis are vague and generic.

Option 3 – arguments for

The candidate does not achieve any marks in this paragraph as their attempts at knowledge or analysis are vague and generic.

Arguments against

The candidate does not achieve any marks in this paragraph as their attempts at knowledge or analysis are vague and generic.

Sources

The candidate attempts source evaluation however as none of the sources on the research sheet were referenced this means nothing is creditworthy. No marks are awarded.

Conclusion

The candidate confirms their choice as Option 2: ‘better border relations with France’ and they justify this by saying this would have the most perks with the UK gaining an ally at a risky time. **(1 decision mark awarded)**.

The candidate is awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for appropriate social science terminology

Overall, the candidate is awarded 7 out of 30 marks for this assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: **5 marks**

B: Analysing and synthesising: **0 marks**

C: Source evaluation: **0 marks**

D: Structure: **1 mark**

E: Reaching a decision: **1 mark**

Candidate 2

Assignment title: What action should Scottish Government prioritise to relieve pressure on overcrowding jails in Scotland?

Background and framing

In lines 1-2 of this section, the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the comment, ‘it is important …prison population reached 8,430 in October 2025.’ In lines 2-5, the candidate is awarded a further **1 framing KU mark** for ‘this issue is …Prisoners (Early Release) Act 2025’. From lines 5-7, the candidate goes on to discuss early release figures and offences ‘which decreased …domestic abuse offences’ so a further **1 framing KU mark** is awarded. In lines 7-9, the candidate provides information on early release ‘This came even …477 prisoners were released early’. This is awarded **1 framing KU mark**. Lines 10-12 is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for ‘This issue directly …over 1 in 10 prisoners released’.

From lines 13-18, the candidate gives more knowledge on taxation and public services but has reached the maximum **5 framing KU marks.**

The candidate goes on to discuss their three options and could have been awarded further framing knowledge marks had they not already reached the ceiling for this type of mark.

The candidate makes a decision at the top of the second page, which is not awarded a mark as they provide no justification, but this does signal their line of argument.

Decision

The candidate then starts to discuss their first solution - Option 1: expanding noncustodial sentencing.

Arguments in Favour of decision (Option 1)

In lines 1 and 2, the candidate opens by discussing ‘expanding and normalising noncustodial sentencing’ and in lines 4-8, the candidate supports this by using

Source 1 and the '32 local authorities …and 71% CPOs ...monitored and managed' - **1 analysis mark** awarded.

The candidate then supports this in lines 7-9, 'this indicates a significant …true by 60% of people in Scotland' and is awarded **1 KU (in support of analysis) mark.** The candidate goes onto discuss this in Source 11 lines 9-12, 'This indicates …reoffending rate for community-based sentences …reduce prison inflow' and is awarded **1 analysis mark**. The remainder of the paragraph justifies why this decision is correct to tackle Scotland's overcrowding crisis and is awarded **2 decision marks.**

In the second paragraph of this section the candidate starts to discuss their second reason for option 1 by arguing it is financially more sustainable (lines 1-3) and as they then refer to Source 3, **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis in lines 3-7 of this paragraph: 'this argument is based ... government resources and money.'

The candidate then supports this in lines 9-10, 'annual cost of imprisoning …educating one pupil per year' and is awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)**. In lines 12-19, the candidate goes onto discuss cost of prison using Sources 4 and 5 and **1 analysis mark** is awarded, to 'This is proven true …pressure on the public purse'. In lines 12-19, the candidate claims this is 'BK' but it is analysis of the sources. In lines 19 -25, the candidate continues their discussion of the economic benefits using source 2 and **1 analysis mark** is awarded, 'While source 2 acknowledges that electronic ……within the community.'

The candidate then starts to discuss their second solution and its rejection.

Arguments for Option 2 and why this was rejected

In lines 1-4 of this section, 'It might appear …addiction-related offending' the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for use of Source 6. A further **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** is awarded for lines 4-8, 'Indeed, since 45%… cause of crime'. The candidate then further discusses why this should be rejected and a further **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** is awarded for the lines 8-12 'however this argument …primary focus for the SG'.

The candidate then discusses further the reasons to reject this solution. No marks are awarded as no specific knowledge was provided or sources referenced.

In lines 18-25, ‘This argument …. addiction recovery” **1 analysis mark** is awarded as the candidate effectively uses Source 7.

No marks are awarded for the last sentence as this provides more justification for Option 1 which already gained 2 marks earlier which is the maximum number of marks for justifying the decision.

Arguments for Option 3 and why this was rejected

In lines 1-5 of this section, the candidate begins by discussing the impact of education.**1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis of Source 8, ‘it might appear …overcrowding in jails’.

A further **1 analysis mark** is awarded from lines 5-8 of this section, ‘Therefore increasing …the prison population.’

The candidate then further discusses why this should be rejected and a further **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the lines 8-14, ‘however I reject this …are already overstretched’.

The candidate then discusses further the reasons to reject this solution, and **2 analysis marks** would have been awarded for lines 14-23, ‘This heavily implies…. direct impact now’ had the candidate not already achieved 10 analysis marks.

In lines 24-30, ‘moreover, even if …. provided to young people’ the candidate argues why this is not the best option and is **awarded 1 knowledge mark**.

In lines 30 – 36, the candidate continues by discussing technology. ‘Additionally, Source 10 …. the superior choice.’ **1 analysis mark** would have been awarded had the candidate not already achieved the maximum number of marks for analysis.

Evaluation of sources

In lines 1-4, ‘Source 1 was the most reliable … prestigious academic institution’ **1 evaluation mark** is awarded.

In lines 6-9, ‘in addition the SCCJ …statistics.’ **1 evaluation mark** is awarded.

The candidate has reached the maximum evaluation marks but would have been awarded 2 evaluation marks for the discussion of Source 2. The candidate evaluates the two sources in great detail and goes beyond what would be required for 2 marks.

Conclusion

The candidate justifies why they chose option 1 with evidence but has already been awarded these marks. The candidate justifies rejection of option 2 and 3 with evaluation and comparison and is awarded **2 decision marks.**

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for headings and sections
- **1 mark** for referencing and use of background knowledge
- **1 mark** for referring to evidence used
- **1 mark** for consistency, coherence and logic of argument

Overall, the candidate is awarded 30 out of 30 marks for this assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: **10 marks**

B: Analysing and synthesising: **10 marks**

C: Source evaluation: **2 marks**

D: Structure: **4 marks**

E: Reaching a decision: **4 marks**

Candidate 3

Title: How can Scotland reduce smoking rates?

Introduction

In lines 1-4. ‘My name is .....14% of adults in Scotland smoke’ - **1 framing KU mark** is awarded. No mark is given for the general list of health issues, but the 14% statistic is correct and mark worthy.

In lines 4-5, ‘and in 2022 there…smoking in Scotland.’ - **2 framing KU marks** are awarded for both correct statistics about the number of deaths linked to smoking in 2022 and the 1 in 5 figure.

In lines 5 -7, for ‘There are on average 88,779…’ … costs the NHS millions of pounds every year’ a further **1 framing KU mark** is awarded.

In lines 7-8, the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark,** ‘Smoking is also linked…least deprived areas’ for the comparison of the most deprived and least deprived areas.

The candidate has now reached the maximum 5 background framing marks.

Option 1 – Increase tax on cigarettes

In lines 1-6, ‘One way…less disposable income**’** is awarded **1 analysis mark** for the use of source 1 and analysis which came before the source reference.

In lines 7-9, ‘Cigarettes prises have also down …rates over time’ is awarded **1 knowledge in (support of analysis) mark.**

In lines 10-14, ‘However, this option has… how good this policy is’ is awarded **1 knowledge mark (in support of analysis)** as the candidate justifies the downsides of option 1 and correctly points out that this option could increase illegal cigarette sales.

Option 2 – Increase funding for NHS stop smoking services

In lines 1-4, ‘Another option…smoking rates are higher’ could have been awarded **1 framing KU mark** but the candidate has already reached the ceiling for this type of mark.

In lines 7-10, ‘Source 2 states …struggle to quit smoking’ is awarded **1 analysis mark** for the use of Source 2 and the analytical comment that followed.

Lines 10-12 are not awarded any marks as they are too simplistic.

Option 3 – Reduce more smoke free public areas

The first sentence gives context but is awarded no marks.

In lines 3-5, ‘In Scotland in 2016…exposed too’ could have been awarded **1 framing KU mark** but again, this candidate has hit the ceiling for knowledge framing marks.

In lines 5-8, ‘This shows… work in practice’ is awarded **1 knowledge (in support of analysis) mark** for consideration of a positive and negative of the policy.

Conclusion

The candidate then moves on to their conclusion where they discuss all three options.

In lines 1-3, ‘In conclusion …. low incomes’ is awarded **1 decision mark**

A further **1 decision mark** is awarded for lines 3-5 ‘and Option 3 it was being followed’

The final sentence beginning ‘Source 2…’ down to the end of the paragraph is also awarded **1 decision mark.**

The candidate is awarded 4 structure marks:

- **1 mark** for structure including the use of headings and sections
- **1 mark** for report style including social science terminology
- **1 mark** for consistency, coherence and logic of argument
- **1 mark** was given for referring to evidence used, including research evidence

Overall, the candidate is awarded 17 out of 30 marks for this assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: **8 marks**

B: Analysing and synthesising: **2 marks**

C: Source evaluation: **N/R**

D: Structure: **4 marks**

E: Reaching a decision: **3 marks**

Candidate 4

Gun control in the USA: should firearms be banned, retained, or more strictly regulated?

Introduction

In lines 1-3, of the introduction the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the description of gun control.

In lines 4-8, the candidate provides evidence from Source A about gun ownership but does not analyse this information and is therefore awarded no marks.

In lines 9-10, the candidate discusses 'the debate for the different ways …the huge scales of everyday violence surrounding guns'. They then provide evidence from Source B in lines 10-13, 'According to Source B within the Unites States …and more than 200 people shot and wounded daily'. No marks are awarded as analysis marks can only be given for source use if this supports a course of action.

In lines 13-21, the candidate outlines the three solutions to the issue. No marks are awarded for this as no justifications were provided

Solution 1 – Banning guns

The candidate discusses their first solution.

In lines 1-6, the candidate discusses the solution in more detail. No marks are awarded for this.

From lines 6 -8, the candidate discusses the fact that banning guns would 'significantly reduce gun related deaths and violent crimes'. In lines 8-13, the candidate discusses Australia and provides information from Source C, 'gun related homicides …5% in firearms deaths'. The candidate then, in lines 13-15, discusses the impact of 'having fewer guns in availability …potential harm to others'. The candidate provides some analysis before and after quoting source C and the two points together are awarded **1 analysis mark**.

In lines 15-17, the candidate is awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** 'Given that firearms are involved in majority of homicides …helping to give individuals a sense of safety'

In lines 18-22, the candidate discusses the Second Amendment. Two separate points are made, a description and then a comment on the difficulty of introducing a full ban and **2 KU marks (in support of analysis)** are awarded.

In lines 22-26 candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for analysis of Source D, 'showing that criminals would still …could be left disarmed'.

Solution 2 – Retaining guns

The candidate starts by discussing current gun laws. **1 framing KU mark** is awarded for lines 1-4 for description of gun laws, 'another solution …to buy a long gun'.

In lines 4-8, the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for the analysis of Source A, 'Supporters of this solution argue …defend themselves if needed'. The candidate analyses source before providing evidence.

A further **1 analysis mark** is awarded for lines 9-13 where the candidate provides further analysis of Source A, 'Supporters also argue that criminals …takes away the right to an equal fight.' Inlines 14-20, the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for analysis of Source B, 'However, evidence… problems that occur everyday'.

Solution 3 – Stricter regulations

The candidate discusses their final solution, stricter gun regulations. The candidate is awarded **1 framing KU** mark for 'Another solution is to …seen as a risk' in lines 1-5.

The candidate attempts to analyse Source E in lines 5-7, 'supporters of this solution argue …homicide linked to the usage of firearms' but no marks are awarded as analysis was a rewording of Source E.

1 analysis mark is awarded for the remainder of the paragraph, 'Supporters also argue that …dangerous people from legally owning guns'

In lines 15-19, the candidate is awarded **1 analysis mark** for use of Source G, ‘However, stricter laws ...law abiding citizens to legally own firearms.’

Evaluation

The candidate is awarded **1 evaluation mark** for Source A and the discussion of larger sample size.

The candidate is awarded **1 evaluation mark** for Source G and the discussion of date.

Conclusion/Decision

The candidate gives detailed reasons for their decision and is awarded **2 decision marks** for lines 5-9, ‘Stricter regulations reduces gun related deaths ...under the Second Amendment’. The candidate attempts to explain reasons for rejecting other options in lines 9-11 but it is not creditworthy as it lacks detail.

The candidate was awarded 4 structure marks:

- **1 mark** for structure including the use of headings and sections
- **1 mark** for report style including social science terminology
- **1 mark** for consistency, coherence and logic of argument
- **1 mark** was given for referring to evidence used, including research evidence

Overall, the candidate is awarded 21 out of 30 marks for this assignment:

A: Knowledge and understanding: **6 marks**

B: Analysing and synthesising: **7 marks**

C: Source evaluation: **2 marks**

D: Structure: **4 marks**

E: Reaching a decision: **2 marks**