



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/12

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2021

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **17** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Annotations

As noted, scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. Scripts are marked on RM Assessor and these on-screen annotations are available. They should be used as required by the mark scheme and guidance.

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point. Used in Question 1 only.
	Incorrect point. Used in Question 1 or for clear error elsewhere.
	Unclear/confused point
ND	Needs developing. When used alone simply identifies a point made without development. Used in both Question 2 and 3.
ND+ or ND-	Partially developed strength (ND+) or weakness (ND-). Used for general , supported points in Question 2. [ND and + or – added separately]
+ or -	Fully developed strength or weakness. Used for fully supported points in Question 2.

Annotation	Meaning
ND EVAL	Partially Developed Evaluation. Used in Question 3 to show where general points are made.
EVAL	Fully Developed Evaluation. Explanation and illustration, fully supporting points in Question 3.
C	Comparison of content. Used in Question 3 when no evaluation ; simply comparison of documents
J	Judgement. Used alone as J to show full judgement, or as ND J , to show partial judgement. Especially used in Question 3.
	Not answering the question. For example, when introducing own knowledge.
	Repetition. When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
L1 L2 L3	Level 1, 2 or 3 response. Used in Question 2 and Question 3 to allocate a level for each criterion in the levels tables. They can be used together, like L3/L2 to show a split grade . Used alone to give overall level for the question. (See guidance on last 4 pages)
	On Page Comment. Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

Please follow the guidance within the mark scheme on how to annotate each question.

Note

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer, they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

- Mark grids describe the top of each level.
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation	- analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based - analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain - synthesize relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives - critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives - critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives - use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives
--	--

Coverage of Assessment Objectives:**1.a** Q1 (a), Q1 (b), Q2, Q3**1.b** Q2, Q3**1.c** Q2, Q3**1.d** Q2, Q3**1.e** Q2, Q3**1.f** Q2, Q3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Identify <u>two</u> different problems with producing bioplastics, as given by the author of Document 1. RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded. Credit 1 mark for a correctly stated problem up to a maximum of 2. Accept correct quotations from the text. The key word in the question is ‘producing’ so anything about the impact of bioplastics is not creditworthy Examples of 1 mark answers: • They require a huge financial investment in land ✓ /fertilisers/chemicals • (Using plants for plastic production rather than food production) can lead to food shortages ✓ /food price increases/a food crisis Credit 0 marks • for ‘expensive’ without reference to land/fertilisers/chemicals • for answers related to problems of global plastic waste, for example <i>damages the environment</i> <i>threatens animal life</i> <i>presents health risks to humans</i> for answers with no creditworthy material	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Explain <u>two</u> different advantages that Indonesia has in producing bioplastics, as given by the author of Document 1. RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded. Credit 1 mark for correctly stating an advantage (simple), plus an additional mark if this is correctly explained (developed) An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidate's own understanding. However, it does require using the text rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis or correct synthesis of parts of the text. Examples shown as 'developed' could be credited as 'simple', especially if directly quoted. For example: - Indonesia is one of the world's largest (red) seaweed producers / produces a third of global seaweed. (Simple) ✓ (UN FAO claims) The climate and geographical conditions of Indonesia are very good for growing red seaweed / seaweed is an important raw material for bioplastics (due to its carbohydrate content) / seaweed is the best candidate for bioplastics so far*. (Developed) ✓ [*This can be quoted directly as it is synthesised from a different paragraph (4)] - Indonesia already has experience in bioplastics (through Evoware), (Simple) ✓ which means that it has a head start on other countries in developing the process. (Developed) ✓ Also Credit 1 mark - for correct simple statements without explanation (as above). - for correct simple statements taken directly from the text, for example <i>Indonesia is a highly suitable place for red seaweed farming</i> ✓ Credit 0 marks - for answers not specific to Indonesia / about seaweed in general e.g. Bioplastic production from seaweed is cheaper than other materials Bioplastic production from seaweed does not contribute to the problem of feeding populations - for answers with no creditworthy material. 2 × 1 + 1 marks	4

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence that the author gives in Document 1 to support his argument about bioplastics. Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks. NB Level 3 involves the impact of the evidence upon the claim – a key characteristic. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: Strengths: The author: • gives relevant evidence to directly support the conclusion – gives self-evident evidence of the benefits of seaweed over land-based plants and evidence for why Indonesia has advantages from <i>ACPIR</i>, <i>UN FAO</i> and of <i>Evoware</i>. These give support to the conclusion that <i>Indonesia should play a key role</i>. • gives some context in evidence – through evidence of use of other materials using land-based plants e.g. <i>corn</i>, <i>sugarcane</i> for bioplastics. This gives the wider context of the issue, demonstrating the benefits of seaweed for bioplastics within this. • uses statistical evidence – e.g. to indicate to the reader the precise extent and significance of the problem: <i>SEA ... 7 billion tonnes of waste</i> and <i>Environmental Research Letters ... up to 51 trillion particles globally</i>; also towards a solution in Indonesia <i>ACPIR</i> value of seaweed exports <i>USD 20 million</i>. • uses many sources with authority – Almost all the evidence has a stated source e.g. prestigious research bodies most directly related to the issue – <i>Sea Education Association</i>, and <i>Australian Centre for Pacific Islands Research</i>, <i>Environment Research Letters</i>; and global trusted authority – <i>UN FAO</i>. • uses relevant examples as evidence – of big Brands <i>Coca-Cola</i>, <i>Heinz</i>, <i>Unilever</i>, <i>Nestle</i>, <i>Danone</i> and <i>Nike</i> to illustrate the extent of companies involved in Bioplastics; also, <i>Evoware</i> as an example to illustrate that Indonesia has already bioplastic from seaweed solutions. • uses up to date evidence – The article was written in <i>2018</i>, using <i>latest data from US university research</i>, <i>a recent study in ERL</i>, <i>a recent report from the UN</i>, which means that article is based on current awareness of the problem and solutions. • has authorial relevant first-hand experience – both of the geographical area and the specifics of seaweed and bioplastics – <i>PhD candidate at Victoria University, Australia researching in biodegradable plastic from seaweed</i>. This gives the insight to be able to select relevant evidence and make informed judgements, presented in a logical academic scholarly argument.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Weaknesses: The author: • presents limited evidence for the conclusion – <i>Indonesia should play a <u>key role</u></i>, as although he gives evidence about the suitability of Indonesia's environment for seaweed production – <i>UN FAO</i> and the fact that it is the <i>largest producer of red seaweed</i>, he however does not discuss whether this supply is sustainable enough to be used in a potentially <i>huge</i> enterprise in bioplastics. • gives limited global evidence for the conclusion – The author limits the significance of the evidence to support the claim that <i>Indonesia</i> should play a <i>key role</i>, without giving the context of other possible global solutions. • Lacks counterevidence / balanced evidence – The author presents only the advantages of Indonesia's e.g. <i>largest producer of red seaweed</i> and <i>one step ahead</i>, but does not point out any problems in the production to give the full context. • uses an unsupported exaggerated claim following the conclusion – <i>we will have <u>nothing</u> to worry about as the waste will just go back to where it came from</i> – there is no evidence to support decomposition time – which reduces confidence. • uses some vague statistics – <i>exports were valued at around USD 200 million ... production increasing at about 30% per year</i>, which limits the significance of the statistical evidence. • presents a key example that may not be significant – The example of <i>Evoware</i> may give limited support to the claim that <i>Indonesia is one step ahead</i> and <i>shows seaweed's huge potential</i> if this a very small enterprise or if a lone enterprise and its success is not transferrable. • uses unsupported aspirations – about the significance of the start-up evidence <i>more research is needed....in the future we hope that</i>. This gives limited support to the conclusion <i>Indonesia should play a key role</i> as it is dependent on the hypothetical situation that <i>seaweed-based plastics will be as versatile as conventional plastics because of the lack of evidence</i>. • has possibly less neutrality – the author <i>worked in research institutes for 13 years linked to the Indonesian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries</i>, so may have a vested interest to present evidence for Indonesia as a key global player in bioplastics from seaweed. There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The authors of Documents 1 and 2 reach different conclusions about bioplastics. How far is the author's argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1? Use the levels-based marking tables and guidance on Pages 14 and 15 to credit marks. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: More convincing because provides: • more balanced realistic conclusion – Hares (Doc 2) provides a balanced conclusion recognising bioplastic technology <i>progressing</i> but at the same time identifying <i>major hurdles</i>; whereas Sedayu's conclusion (Doc 1) only points to the major role of seaweed in Indonesia <i>should play a key role</i> without mention of possible problems. • more balanced argument/less selective – Hares (Doc 2) looks at the negatives as well as positives of bioplastics <i>getting people to change is really hard, not as environmentally friendly, main obstacle is the cost</i>; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) does not mention the problems of seaweed production, only the positives of using seaweed being <i>cheaper</i> and <i>avoiding a food crisis</i>. • stronger supporting evidence for the conclusion – Hares (Doc 2) provides evidence from <i>Ford, Columbia University, BIOFACE and Ecoshell</i> both to support the progress and highlight the problems; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) provides claims from ACPIR about <i>seaweed exports</i> and <i>UNFOA about suitable place</i> to support Indonesia's key role without supporting evidence about disposal problems. • more sources with first-hand experience – Hares (Doc 2) uses <i>Ford, Ecoshell, CBB and BIOFACE</i> to provide personal experience in the field; whereas Sedayu's argument (Doc 1) relies more on his own views based on statistical evidence and self-evident reasoning about <i>land</i> and <i>cost</i> hurdles overcome, which may carry less authority. • less possible motive/bias – Hares (Doc 2) is an <i>independent journalist</i> without an apparent motive to commend or criticise the production of bioplastics; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) <i>worked in research institutes for 13 years linked to the Indonesian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries</i>, so may have a vested interest to present Indonesia as a key global player in bioplastics from seaweed.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Less convincing because: • less authority of sources – Hares (Doc 2) uses mainly the personal views of industry founders/workers; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) uses prestigious research bodies directly related to the issue – <i>Sea Education Association</i>, and <i>Australian Centre for Pacific Islands Research</i> and <i>Environment Research Letters</i>, and (global trusted authority – <i>UN FAO</i> which may be more convincing because of their wider authority. • less positive/practical – Hares (Doc 2) presents the progress and <i>major hurdles</i> without coming to a solution; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) discusses the problems and argues how Indonesia's seaweed offers a solution to both problems of <i>land</i> and <i>cost</i>. • less authorial expertise Hares (Doc 2) is an <i>independent journalist</i> with no known specialist knowledge in the issue of bioplastics; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) has relevant experience both of the geographical area and the specifics of seaweed and bioplastics – <i>PhD candidate in Australia researching in biodegradable plastic from seaweed</i>. This gives insight to select relevant material and make informed judgements and be more convincing. Neither more nor less convincing because similar: • Both have clear conclusions and a structured argument – Hares (Doc 2) that <i>bioplastics is progressing</i> and <i>major hurdles remain</i>; whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) concludes <i>Indonesia should play a key role to prevent an even worse plastic crisis</i>. • Both point out the negative side of plastics – Hares (Doc 2) uses statistics from the <i>UN</i>; and Sedayu (Doc 1) uses statistics <i>US university research</i> and <i>Sea Education Association</i>. • Both present some balance of argument – Hares (Doc 2) the progression of bioplastics and the <i>major hurdles</i>; and Sedayu (Doc 1) the problems of bioplastics and how seaweed overcomes the challenges of <i>land</i> and <i>cost</i>. • Both provide the wider context – Hares (Doc 2) uses evidence of Bioplastic use from the <i>US</i> and <i>Mexico</i> setting the issues in a wider context for the reader to judge significance; and Sedayu (Doc 1) mentions <i>global</i> figures relating to the problems of plastic, and big brands using bioplastics e.g. <i>Coca-Cola</i>, <i>Heinz...</i>, again showing significance of the issues. • Both provide some sourced evidence/statistics – Hares (Doc 2) from industry <i>Ford</i>, <i>BIOFACE</i>, <i>Ecoshell</i>; and Sedayu (Doc 1) <i>Sea Education Association</i>, <i>Australian Centre for Pacific Islands Research</i>, <i>Environment Research Letters</i> and <i>UN FAO</i>, providing authority.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Neither more nor less convincing because different: • They provide different perspectives geographically. – Hares (Doc 2) focuses on land-based bioplastics in the west (<i>US</i> and <i>Mexico</i>); whereas Sedayu (Doc 1) focuses on <i>seaweed</i>-based bioplastics in the east (<i>Indonesia</i>) which as Sedayu says overcomes the problems of land-based solutions in terms of <i>land</i> and <i>cost</i>. So both conclusions are appropriate to their areas. Judgement Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence to reach a judgement. • In doing this they might conclude that Hares' (Doc 2) argument (Doc 2) is more convincing because of the number of first-hand sources and a more balanced conclusion, reasoning and evidence • Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, despite the lack of balance, Sedayu's argument (Doc 1) is stronger because it has more authorial expertise and more in-depth information about the geographical area in question. Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g. that both arguments are equally strong. There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.	

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 12 marks**Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- (a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed (simplistic),
- (b) ND+ or ND- when a strength or weakness has been partially developed (generalised) and
- (c) + or – for a fully developed and explained point of strength or weakness of the evidence used by the author. (detailed) **[Point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document to show impact of the evidence.]**
- (d) J when a judgement is reached (Max 11 marks if judgement not included)

Use the levels table and the guidance to determine an appropriate level and mark:

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	• Both strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is sustained, and a judgement is reached. • Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.
L2	5–8	• Answers focus more on either the strengths or weakness of the evidence, although both are present/identified. • Assessment identifies strength or weakness of evidence with little explanation. • Assessment of evidence is relevant but generalised, not always linked to specific claims. • Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning are limited, but clearly expressed.
L1	1–4	• Answers show little or no assessment of evidence. • Assessment of evidence, if any, is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified, and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive.
X	0	• no creditable material.

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
 - How much assessment of evidence there is
 - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment of the evidence
 - How the evidence is linked to the author's claims
 - Effectiveness of communication

- In simple terms the levels are:
 - Level 3 – detailed and sustained
 - Level 2 – generalised and lacking some assessment/explanation
 - Level 1 – simplistic or descriptive
 - Level 0 – have no creditable material (Mark X)
- **You are required to make a judgement of the level that is the best fit for each bullet point. This can include split levels. These will then inform the overall level and mark within it as illustrated below. The notes for awarding marks on page 3 of the mark scheme are for general guidance that reflect the more detailed approach below.**
- These should be listed at the bottom of the answer in the correct order.
 - e.g. L3 L2 L2 L2

This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the L2 criteria and has one in L3. It is, however, only just in L3 so would be at the bottom of the level and be awarded 9 marks out of 12.

- In the right-hand margin (away from the other 4 level marks) please insert the overall level, in this case L3, then add the mark (9) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L3 L3 L3 L3 Overall Level 3 – Mark 12
This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3.
 - e.g. L2 L1 L2 L1 Overall Level 2 – Mark 6
This is a low middle L2 as the L2 criteria have only been partially met.
 - e.g. L2 L1 L1 L1 Overall Level 2 – Mark 5
This is a low L2 so the mark is at the bottom of the range.
 - e.g. L2 L3/L2 L3/L2 L2 Overall Level 3 – Mark 9
Split grades are allowed where the best fit is a combination of the criteria for two different levels. Treat the L3/L2 as low L3 so overall this would just reach L3 at 9.
 - e.g. L1 X L1 L1 Overall Level 1 – Mark 3
Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 12 marks**Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- (a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed,
- (b) ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents)
- (c) EVAL for a fully developed point that looks at documents and perspectives and uses illustration (perhaps with a quote) from the authors
(Evaluation point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document as explicit reference.)
- (d) C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation. (e.g. X said 'this' and Y said 'that')
- (e) ? for an unclear or confused answer
- (f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	- The judgement is sustained and reasoned. - Alternative perspectives have sustained assessment. - Critical evaluation is of key issues raised in the passages and has explicit reference. - Explanation and reasoning are highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed. - Communication is highly effective – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.
L2	5–8	- Judgement is reasoned. One perspective may be focused upon for assessment. - Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues. - Explanation and reasoning are generally accurate. - Communication is accurate – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.
L1	1–4	- Judgement, if present, is unsupported or superficial. - Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment - Evaluation, if any, is simplistic/undeveloped. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents. - Relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. - Communication is limited. Response may be cursory.
X	0	no creditable material.

- In Question 3 there are 5 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
 - The level of judgement (i.e. how convincing is one document over the other, if at all)
 - Level of perspective (i.e. different viewpoints based on argument, evidence and assumptions within a particular context)
 - Evaluation
 - Explanation and reasoning
 - Communication
- In simple terms the levels are:
 - Level 3 – Sustained, explicit, highly effective
 - Level 2 – Generalised, generally accurate, less focussed on perspectives and evaluation than L3
 - Level 1 – Superficial, simplistic/undeveloped, descriptive
 - Level 0 – No creditable material. Use X as the annotation for this.
- Judgement can be covered throughout the answer with direct evaluation between the documents but can also be achieved by evaluation of the documents separately with a thorough judgement paragraph at the end.
- As in Question 2, put the levels for the 5 bullet points at the end of the answer:
 - e.g. L2 L3 L2 L2 L2

This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the criteria for L2 and has one L3. This puts it at the bottom of the L3 range of marks –i.e. 9.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 8

Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (8 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met.

 - e.g. L2 L2 L1 L1 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 6/7

Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades (ignoring the communication level) bringing it to a mid L2 – 6 or 7 marks. [The L2 for communication might inform your judgement to give the higher mark]
- Split grades are allowed e.g. L2/L1 or L1/X when the answer does not exactly fit the level descriptors. Treat them as low level, so L2/L1 would be a low level 2 when deciding on the overall level and mark.
- **In all levels there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**