Commentary on candidate evidence

Assessors awarded the candidate evidence the following marks for each question.

Candidate 1

Question 1: Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The influence of age on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

No valid conclusion is provided by the candidate to link to previous elections. This is a very unclear response **(0 marks)**.

Conclusion 2: The influence of social class on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

No valid conclusion is provided by the candidate to link to previous elections. Again, a very unclear response **(0 marks)**.

Conclusion 3: The link between campaign spending and voter turnout

The candidate does make a conclusion at the end of the paragraph but uses the word ‘increased’ making it incorrect **(0 marks)**.

Overall conclusion: which factor most influenced voting behaviour in the 2024 UK General Election.

The candidate does not provide a valid, coherent response **(0 marks)**.

The candidate is awarded **0 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 2: Objectivity

To what extent is it accurate to state that weak gun laws are the biggest cause of gun-related deaths in the USA?

Paragraph 1

The candidate is awarded **3 marks** for this paragraph.

A mark is awarded for the quote from Source A **(1 mark)**. A further mark is awarded for an accurate comparison of deaths in Texas and Mississippi **(1 mark)**. A final mark is awarded for the manipulation of figures and consideration of Mississippi's gun law score to aid their comparison **(1 mark)**.

Paragraph 2

The candidate's response is unclear and irrelevant **(0 marks)**.

Paragraph 3

Initially, the candidate starts to oppose the statement. A comparison can be made between police deaths in the two different states, but the candidate does not do this effectively. They use a lot of statistics but fail to provide a coherent argument to oppose the statement **(0 marks)**.

Paragraph 4

A valid overall judgement is made and supported by a piece of valid source evidence **(1 mark)**.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 3: Source reliability

Source A

The candidate makes reference to sample size and covering a wide range of areas and types of people **(1 mark)**.

No mark is awarded for ‘trusted’ as there is no explanation of why it is trusted **(0 marks)**.

Source B

The candidate provides a well-developed explanation of bias **(2 marks)**.

Source C

A mark is awarded for reference to date, for example not up to date with current statistics **(1 mark)**.

A mark is awarded for the first paragraph of the candidate’s overall judgement; the comparison of sources A and B **(1 mark)**. The second paragraph is not worthy of credit as it was unclear and vague **(0 marks)**.

Overall judgement

The candidate i awarded **5 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **9 out of 28 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 2

Question 1: Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The influence of age on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate gives a valid conclusion in the first six lines and supports it with evidence from Sources A and C **(2 marks)**.

Conclusion 2: The influence of social class on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate gives a valid conclusion in lines 1 to 6 of the paragraph. Suitable evidence is provided from Sources A and C **(2 marks)**.

Conclusion 3: The link between campaign spending and voter turnout

The candidate concludes in lines 1 to 6 that as you spend more, turnout declines. Sources A and B are used accurately to support this conclusion **(2 marks)**.

Overall conclusion: which factor most influenced voting behaviour in the 2024 UK General Election.

The conclusion that gender is the most influential cannot be justified by the sources.

The candidate is awarded **6 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 2: Objectivity

To what extent is it accurate to state that weak gun laws are the biggest cause of gun-related deaths in the USA?

Paragraph 1

In the first paragraph, the candidate begins by looking at how the view may be accurate. The candidate uses Source A and Source B to support this **(2 marks)**.

Paragraph 2

The candidate moves on to argue that the statement is inaccurate. They make two references to the importance of mental health (Sources A and C) **(2 marks)**.

Paragraph 3

The candidate reverts to supporting the view. Source B statistics are used in conjunction with a quote from Source A **(2 marks)**.

Paragraph 4

The candidate returns to opposing the view – the 'hand in hand' quote from Source C and statistics relating to poverty in Mississippi are combined effectively **(2 marks)**.

Paragraph 5

The candidate makes a quantitative judgement (mostly inaccurate) and supports it well with comment on Mississippi regarding gun laws, gun deaths and poverty **(2 marks)**.

The candidate Is awarded **10 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 3: Source reliability

Source A

A mark Is awarded for the assertion that YouGov is well-respected and as a result it is used by many media outlets **(1 mark)**. Simply stating that a source is popular or well-known Is not worthy of a mark. A further mark is awarded for reference to the big, reliable sample size **(1 mark)**.

Source B

The candidate is awarded marks for the reference to right wing bias and distaste for Keir Starmer **(2 marks)**. A further mark could have been awarded for the argument that it is only one person's view; the journalist. However, the candidate has already reached the maximum of 2 marks available for Source B.

Source C

A mark is awarded for the assertion that they have expertise, hence increasing reliability **(1 mark)**. A further mark is awarded for arguing that the source is old and wrong; ‘statistics may be different now’ **(1 mark)**. Simply stating that a source is old or new/recent on its own is not creditworthy – it must be explained/qualified by a phrase such as ‘statistics may be different now.’

Overall judgement

The candidate is awarded **2 marks** for accurate comparisons of Source A as opposed to Sources B and C.

The candidate is awarded **8 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **24 out of 28 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 3

Question 1: Conclusions

Conclusion 2: The influence of social class on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate opens with conclusion 2. They make a valid conclusion in lines 4 and 5 of the paragraph and a similar conclusion at the end of the paragraph however, both essentially say the same thing. Source A is used effectively in the first four lines, providing the essential reference to previous elections. Source C is then quoted to provide a valid comparison of social classes A/B voting for Labour and Conservative in 2024. Source A is then used again to claim that wealthy people, for example social classes A/B, have changed and voted Labour **(3 marks)**.

Conclusion 1: The influence of age on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate provides a lot of commentary on source information but fails to give a valid conclusion and is therefore not awarded any marks for this conclusion **(0 marks)**.

Conclusion 3: The link between campaign spending and voter turnout

In line 1 of the paragraph, the candidate makes a slightly incomplete but valid conclusion; ‘Campaign spending means less people vote’. They do this again in the final line of the paragraph; ‘Overall, campaigning means that there is less voting’.

They refer to both Sources A and B to support this and although the figures quoted may have been slightly inaccurate, marks are awarded as the conclusion was sufficiently supported **(2 marks)**.

The candidate provides some information in lines 9-12 about types of campaigning which is not creditworthy **(0 marks)**.

Overall conclusion: which factor most influenced voting behaviour in the 2024 UK General Election.

The candidate makes a valid conclusion (age) and provides information from Source A to support this **(1 mark)**.

The candidate is awarded **6 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 2: Objectivity

To what extent is it accurate to state that weak gun laws are the biggest cause of gun-related deaths in the USA?

Paragraph 1

In the first paragraph, the candidate begins by looking at how the view may be accurate.

In lines 1-5 of the paragraph, the candidate uses Source A to comment on the gun laws and the ease of access to guns in three states. This piece of information does not make the link to gun related deaths so, on its own is worth no marks. However, they move on to compare the gun related death rates of California and Alabama (Source B) which is accurate and links to the Source A information used earlier **(2 marks)**. No further marks are awarded for this paragraph.

Please note - although the candidate does not use the term ‘per 100,000’ when comparing states, this does not invalidate their comparison nor the meaning of their argument. However, if a candidate misquotes a statistic to the extent that the meaning of their point is changed, then they should not be credited.

Paragraph 2

The candidate moves to argue that the statement is inaccurate.

In the first 6 lines of the paragraph, the candidate quotes Source C for stating that poverty and gun deaths go ‘hand in hand’ **(1 mark)**. The candidate misinterprets the statistics from Source B and receives no further marks in the remainder of this paragraph.

Paragraph 3

The candidate moves on to the issue of police shootings in Source C. In the first 12 lines of the paragraph, the comparison of shootings in Texas and California and the fact that California has strict gun laws is made **(1 mark)**. This is despite slight inaccuracies; 'the biggest presence of guns' and 'Texas has the most deaths' and California has 'very few'. In the final 4 lines of the paragraph, a valid overall point is provided and supported **(1 mark)**.

The candidate is awarded **5 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 3: Source reliability

Source A

The candidate is awarded a mark for the point made in the first 6 lines of the paragraph concerning sample size and the range of viewpoints this will capture **(1 mark)**. The remainder of the paragraph is awarded no further marks as the candidate mistakes YouGov for a government body.

Source B

The first 4 lines of the paragraph are awarded a mark for the explanation of political leanings leading to bias and reducing reliability **(1 mark)**.

No further marks are awarded for the remainder of the paragraph as the source is two years old and is not 'in-date' and reliable as the candidate asserts.

Source C

In the first half of the paragraph, the candidate correctly states that a pressure group (or charity) may well be biased in favour of their own campaign goals **(1 mark)**.

No further marks are awarded for the remainder of the paragraph as the source is two years old and is not 'in-date' and reliable as the candidate asserts.

Overall judgement

The candidate makes an overall judgement on the most reliable source, that being Source A. They give a valid reason why Source A is better than Source B (highly skilled researchers) **(1 mark)**. In the rest of the paragraph, they explain why Source A is better than Source C (Source C contains bias) **(1 mark)**.

The candidate is awarded **5 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **16 out of 28 marks** for the question paper.

Candidate 4

Question 1: Conclusions

Conclusion 1: The influence of age on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate provides extensive commentary on source information but has failed to give a valid conclusion and is therefore awarded no marks **(0 marks)**.

Conclusion 2: The influence of social class on voting behaviour compared to previous elections

The candidate makes a valid conclusion in lines 1 to 6 of the paragraph, that the AB voters have changed. They give evidence from Source A that AB voters previously voted Conservative (creating the crucial reference to previous elections) and then used Source C to show how they now prefer Labour by 36 to 26 **(2 marks)**.

Conclusion 3: The link between campaign spending and voter turnout

In lines 1-4 of the paragraph, the candidate makes a valid conclusion; ‘Campaign spending is ineffective’. They give figures from Source A to show spending has increased (‘a huge increase’) and then comment that Source B shows that turnout has ‘significantly’ decreased **(2 marks)**. Their claim that it has fallen by ‘over 6%’ is vague and inaccurate, gaining no further credit.

Overall conclusion: which factor most influenced voting behaviour in the 2024 UK General Election.

The final paragraph of the response attempts an overall conclusion but provides no evidence in support **(0 marks)**.

The candidate is awarded **4 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 2: Objectivity

To what extent is it accurate to state that weak gun laws are the biggest cause of gun-related deaths in the USA?

Paragraph 1

The candidate used Source A and comparative statistics from Source B to support the statement **(2 marks)**. At the end of the paragraph, they manipulate the figures to state the difference in gun-related death rates in California and Alabama **(1 mark)**.

Please note - although the candidate does not always use the term ‘per 100,000’ when comparing states, this does not invalidate their comparison or the meaning of their argument. However, if a candidate mis-quotes statistic to the extent that the meaning of their point is changed, then they should not be credited.

Paragraph 2

The candidate moves to argue that the statement is inaccurate.

Source A is used to make the link to mental illness causing gun-related deaths **(1 mark)**. The candidate attempts to back this up by referring to President Trump’s claims in Source C however, their use of ellipses means that the key words in the quotation (’weak gun laws’ and ‘untreated’) do not appear in the candidate’s response and so they cannot be credited for this.

Paragraph 3

In lines 1-6 of the paragraph, the candidate uses source A to support the view **(1 mark).**

From ’Backed up’ on lines 6 and 7, to the end of the paragraph, the candidate tries to further support the statement by using irrelevant evidence from Source C gaining no further credit.

Paragraph 4

The three lines in this paragraph simply state some figures from Source B without comparison or comment **(0 marks)**.

Paragraph 5

Reference is made to the 60% statistic in Source A but cannot be awarded any marks without reference to mental health from Sources A and C **(0 marks)**. On its own, the evidence from Source A does not allow a judgement about gun laws to be made.

Paragraph 6

No credit is given as no valid argument is made **(0 marks)**.

The candidate is awarded **5 out of 10 marks** for this question.

Question 3: Source reliability

Source A

The candidate is awarded no marks for the first 12 lines of the paragraph as YouGov is not controlled by the government and it is not up to date and relevant (it is a year old). The final 3 lines, referring to the sample size being 4,670 and an ‘accurate representation’ are awarded a mark **(1 mark)**.

Source B

From the start of the paragraph to line 7 (‘the stigma of opinion’), a mark is awarded for the assertion that a private business is entitled to state its own views which may be one sided **(1 mark)**.

The remainder of the paragraph does not attract any marks as the source is two years old and may not be ’mostly accurate’ as the candidate asserts.

Source C

The first half of the paragraph correctly states that a pressure group (or charity) may well be biased in favour of their own campaign goals **(1 mark)**.

The remainder of the paragraph does not attract any marks as it is not a Facebook page, and we do know who created it.

Overall judgement

The candidate makes an overall judgement but fails to provide a suitable explanation gaining no further marks **(0 marks)**.

The candidate is awarded **3 out of 8 marks** for this question.

Overall, the candidate is awarded **12 out of 28 marks** for the question paper.