

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**0457/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam

February/March 2025

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

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 February/March 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **24** 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 descriptions 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 Calculation questions:

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 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 guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point
	Incorrect point
	Unclear/confused point
	Explanation
	Evaluation
	Evidence (from source or own knowledge)
	Judgement
	Methods of Research
	Perspective
	Reasoning
	Benefit of doubt given
	Omission mark, more required
	Irrelevant
	Repetition
	Not Answered Question
	Highlighter
	Confirms page or response seen by examiner

The number of ticks used does not need to tally with the mark achieved. Every question must be annotated in some way. The mark scheme indicates the most likely annotation to be used with each question.

Annotation should be within the candidate's text rather than in the margin.

Assessment objectives**AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation**

- design, carry out and evaluate research into current global issues, their causes and consequences and possible course(s) of action
- use evidence to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- identify and analyse issues, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate the evidence and reasoning used to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate sources and/or processes to support research, arguments and perspectives
- develop a line of reasoning to support an argument, a perspective or course(s) of action.

Introduction

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases, candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Levels of response

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.

For answers marked by levels of response:

- Marking 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 of level 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

Mark scheme

All of the questions are based on sources which are available to candidates as an Insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.

The number of ticks used does not need to tally with the mark achieved. Every question must be annotated in some way. The mark scheme indicates the most likely annotation to be used with each question.

Annotation should be within the candidate's text rather than in the margin.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>From Source 1, which communication technology took the least time to reach 100 million users?</p> <p>Main Annotations  </p> <p>From Source 1, candidates are expected to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ChatGPT <p>Award 1 mark for the correct answer.</p>	1
1(b)(i)	<p>Identify <u>one</u> example of a value from Source 2.</p> <p>Main Annotations  </p> <p>From Source 2, candidates are expected to identify one of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • everybody should have equal access • (the internet) is an important resource • Other reasonable response <p>Award 1 mark for a correct answer.</p>	1
1(b)(ii)	<p>Explain why the example you identified is a value.</p> <p>Main Annotations  </p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>A value is a moral or ethical principle of right or wrong, fair or unfair applied to a person's opinion and stance on a given issue. It is something which is important and strongly believed in.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for a response which clearly explains why the identified example is a value.</p> <p>Award 1 mark if the response shows understanding of a value but the relationship to the example is not clear.</p> <p>Award 0 if there is no creditable response.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks																		
1(c)	<p>From Source 2, describe the charity's perspective on digital communication.</p> <p>Main Annotations E P</p> <p>Table A</p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 495 1318 1263"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 495 1318 555">Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 555 440 620">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 555 1182 620">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 555 1318 620">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 620 440 826">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 620 1182 826"> <p>Clear analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective. • Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 620 1318 826">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 826 440 994">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 826 1182 994"> <p>Some analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a range of elements of the perspective. • Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 826 1318 994">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 994 440 1200">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 994 1182 1200"> <p>Limited analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective. • Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 994 1318 1200">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1200 440 1263">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1200 1182 1263">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1200 1318 1263">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content Candidates may describe the following elements of the perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue- safe and fair access to digital communication • Values- everybody should have equal access; (the internet) is an important resource; people (should be able to) follow events around the world as they happen • Cause- technological change and growth • Consequence- the digital divide and dangers • Action- the provision of training, guidance and support offered by the charity • Other relevant response 	Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	3	<p>Clear analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective. • Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. 	5–6	2	<p>Some analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a range of elements of the perspective. • Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. 	3–4	1	<p>Limited analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective. • Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	6
Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)																				
Level	Description	Marks																		
3	<p>Clear analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective. • Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. 	5–6																		
2	<p>Some analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a range of elements of the perspective. • Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source. 	3–4																		
1	<p>Limited analysis of the source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective. • Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source. 	1–2																		
0	No creditable response	0																		

Question	Answer	Marks																					
1(d)	<p>Sources 1 and 2 suggest some consequences of digital communication.</p> <p>Which consequence of digital communication do you think is the most significant? Explain why.</p> <p>Main Annotations EXP J R</p> <p>Table B</p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 622 1318 1532"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 622 1318 687">Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 687 440 752">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 687 1182 752">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 687 1318 752">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 752 440 922">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 752 1182 922"> Clear justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is clearly explained and supported. • The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 752 1318 922">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 922 440 1093">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 922 1182 1093"> Some justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is explained with some support. • The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 922 1318 1093">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1093 440 1294">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 1093 1182 1294"> Partial justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support. • The explanation is partly related to the identified issue. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1093 1318 1294">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1294 440 1464">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1294 1182 1464"> A limited opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is asserted with limited explanation. • Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1294 1318 1464">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1464 440 1532">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1464 1182 1532">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1464 1318 1532">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may identify one of the following consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology has increased rapidly and it is expensive and difficult to stay up to date with this • People have access to endless amounts of information and resources to be able to inform themselves about issues around the world • It provides cost-effective and convenient, easy communication • It has given rise to cyberbullying • Technological disadvantage (digital divide) • Security • Reliability • People have become lonelier • Other relevant response 	Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	Clear justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is clearly explained and supported. • The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue. 	7–8	3	Some justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is explained with some support. • The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue. 	5–6	2	Partial justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support. • The explanation is partly related to the identified issue. 	3–4	1	A limited opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is asserted with limited explanation. • Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	8
Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	Clear justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is clearly explained and supported. • The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue. 	7–8																					
3	Some justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is explained with some support. • The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue. 	5–6																					
2	Partial justification of an opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support. • The explanation is partly related to the identified issue. 	3–4																					
1	A limited opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinion is asserted with limited explanation. • Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Candidates may give the following reasons to justify their opinion: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scope and impact of the consequence• Impact on life, health, wellbeing, understanding of the world around them• Other relevant response.	

Question	Answer	Marks																					
2(a)	<p>Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research outlined in Source 3.</p> <p>Main Annotations EXP EVAL</p> <p>Table C</p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 521 1318 1581"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 521 1318 577">Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 577 440 633">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 577 1182 633">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 577 1318 633">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 633 440 869">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 633 1182 869"> <p>Consistently evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses. Explanations are credible, supported and clearly related to the purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 633 1318 869">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 869 440 1061">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 869 1182 1061"> <p>Mainly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points. Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 869 1318 1061">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1061 440 1292">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 1061 1182 1292"> <p>Partly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1061 1318 1292">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1292 440 1523">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1292 1182 1523"> <p>Limited evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described. Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1292 1318 1523">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1523 440 1581">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1523 1182 1581">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1523 1318 1581">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may identify the following strengths and weaknesses of the research.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary research undertaken (interview and observation) Spoken to someone directly involved in the charity and the issue under study Research is relevant to the scope of the study the student is undertaking as it is locally focused Other relevant response. 	Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	<p>Consistently evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses. Explanations are credible, supported and clearly related to the purpose of the research. 	7–8	3	<p>Mainly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points. Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research. 	5–6	2	<p>Partly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research. 	3–4	1	<p>Limited evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described. Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	8
Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	<p>Consistently evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses. Explanations are credible, supported and clearly related to the purpose of the research. 	7–8																					
3	<p>Mainly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points. Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research. 	5–6																					
2	<p>Partly evaluative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research. 	3–4																					
1	<p>Limited evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described. Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Weaknesses: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interview conducted in a busy lesson with lots of interruptions• Small sample• Sample local to the area so difficult to generalise• Potential bias• Interference with the class; observer effect• Interviewee only estimates extent of the issue, cannot be taken as relevant statistic and requires further investigation.• Other relevant response.	

Question	Answer	Marks																					
2(b)	<p>‘Many households in the local area do not have access to the internet.’</p> <p>Explain how this claim could be tested. You should consider the research methods and evidence that could be used.</p> <p>Main Annotations EXP M E</p> <p>Table D</p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 555 1318 1668"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 555 1318 620">Design research into current global issues (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 620 442 685">Level</th> <th data-bbox="442 620 1182 685">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 620 1318 685">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 685 442 891">4</td> <td data-bbox="442 685 1182 891"> <p>An appropriate and fully justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 685 1318 891">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 891 442 1097">3</td> <td data-bbox="442 891 1182 1097"> <p>An appropriate and justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 891 1318 1097">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1097 442 1332">2</td> <td data-bbox="442 1097 1182 1332"> <p>A partly justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1097 1318 1332">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1332 442 1603">1</td> <td data-bbox="442 1332 1182 1603"> <p>Limited research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topics is only described. Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1332 1318 1603">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1603 442 1668">0</td> <td data-bbox="442 1603 1182 1668">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1603 1318 1668">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews of relevant experts Observation. Review of secondary sources / literature / research / documents. 	Design research into current global issues (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	<p>An appropriate and fully justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	7–8	3	<p>An appropriate and justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	5–6	2	<p>A partly justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	3–4	1	<p>Limited research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topics is only described. Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	8
Design research into current global issues (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	<p>An appropriate and fully justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	7–8																					
3	<p>An appropriate and justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence. Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	5–6																					
2	<p>A partly justified research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation. Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	3–4																					
1	<p>Limited research design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topics is only described. Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet and media search. • Questionnaires. • Surveys. • Case studies of people involved in the topic area. • Other relevant response. <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistics/information on internet use and coverage. • Individual testimony or personal experience. • Material from relevant online organisation. • Material from pressure groups / charities / governments / international organisations concerned about local digital access. • Primary and secondary research data and information. • Quantitative and qualitative research data and information. • Research reports. • Other relevant response. 	

Question	Answer	Marks																					
3	<p>Which argument is more convincing, Todd’s or Hanna’s?</p> <p>Your answer should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider both arguments evaluate their reasoning, evidence and use of language support your judgement with their words and ideas. <p>Main Annotations EVAL EXP E R J</p> <p>Tables E and F</p> <p>Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <p>Table E</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 826 1318 1944"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="304 826 1318 898">Analysis (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 898 440 958">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 898 1182 958">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 898 1318 958">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 958 440 1263">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 958 1182 1263"> <p>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments. Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 958 1318 1263">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1263 440 1473">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 1263 1182 1473"> <p>Mainly analytic and supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments. Some use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear comparison of the two arguments. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1263 1318 1473">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1473 440 1711">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 1473 1182 1711"> <p>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments. Occasional use of material taken from the source. Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1473 1318 1711">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1711 440 1883">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1711 1182 1883"> <p>Descriptive and unsupported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument. Little or no use of material taken from the source. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1711 1318 1883">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1883 440 1944">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1883 1182 1944">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1883 1318 1944">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	<p>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments. Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments. 	7–8	3	<p>Mainly analytic and supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments. Some use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear comparison of the two arguments. 	5–6	2	<p>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments. Occasional use of material taken from the source. Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments. 	3–4	1	<p>Descriptive and unsupported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument. Little or no use of material taken from the source. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	16
Analysis (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	<p>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments. Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments. 	7–8																					
3	<p>Mainly analytic and supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments. Some use of relevant material taken from the source. Clear comparison of the two arguments. 	5–6																					
2	<p>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments. Occasional use of material taken from the source. Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments. 	3–4																					
1	<p>Descriptive and unsupported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument. Little or no use of material taken from the source. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks																					
3	<p>Table F</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 315 1318 1704"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 315 1318 383">Evaluation (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 383 440 450">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 383 1182 450">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 383 1318 450">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 450 440 786">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 450 1182 786"> <p>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response. • Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly. • Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 450 1318 786">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 786 440 1055">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 786 1182 1055"> <p>Mainly evaluative and explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated. • Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 786 1318 1055">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1055 440 1368">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 1055 1182 1368"> <p>Partly evaluative with little explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described. • Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1055 1318 1368">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1368 440 1637">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1368 1182 1637"> <p>Descriptive without explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant. • The topic or the arguments in the source are described. • Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1368 1318 1637">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1637 440 1704">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1637 1182 1704">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1637 1318 1704">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="308 1738 576 1771">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="308 1805 1326 1939">Candidates are expected to evaluate the arguments presented in Source 4. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument. Candidates may support their judgement by considering some of the following aspects of the arguments:</p>	Evaluation (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	<p>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response. • Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly. • Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument. 	7–8	3	<p>Mainly evaluative and explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated. • Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument. 	5–6	2	<p>Partly evaluative with little explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described. • Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument. 	3–4	1	<p>Descriptive without explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant. • The topic or the arguments in the source are described. • Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	
Evaluation (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	<p>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response. • Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly. • Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument. 	7–8																					
3	<p>Mainly evaluative and explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated. • Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument. 	5–6																					
2	<p>Partly evaluative with little explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation. • Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described. • Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument. 	3–4																					
1	<p>Descriptive without explanation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant. • The topic or the arguments in the source are described. • Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks						
3	<p>Strength of reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • logic • structure • balance • claims <p>Use of language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise, measured • clarity <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • range of information and depth • relevance • sufficiency – sample size • source – media; internet • date – how recent • different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert <p>Sources of bias or vested interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local interest • economic • personal values • experience <p>Possible consequences of the ideas or actions presented</p> <p>Acceptability of their values to others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view <p>Other relevant responses should be credited.</p> <p>Examples of evaluative points candidates are likely to discuss are outlined as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1462 1326 1872"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 1462 531 1527">Argument</th> <th data-bbox="531 1462 987 1527">Strengths</th> <th data-bbox="987 1462 1326 1527">Weaknesses</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1527 531 1872">Todd</td> <td data-bbox="531 1527 987 1872"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personally engaged and invested in the topic (concerns of children's future). • cites the UN. • Offers different perspectives. • Other relevant response. </td> <td data-bbox="987 1527 1326 1872"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not overly knowledgeable on the topic • Tone is informal. • No statistics or research applied. • Lots of assertion • Other relevant response. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Argument	Strengths	Weaknesses	Todd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personally engaged and invested in the topic (concerns of children's future). • cites the UN. • Offers different perspectives. • Other relevant response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not overly knowledgeable on the topic • Tone is informal. • No statistics or research applied. • Lots of assertion • Other relevant response. 	
Argument	Strengths	Weaknesses						
Todd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personally engaged and invested in the topic (concerns of children's future). • cites the UN. • Offers different perspectives. • Other relevant response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not overly knowledgeable on the topic • Tone is informal. • No statistics or research applied. • Lots of assertion • Other relevant response. 						

Question	Answer			Marks
3	Argument	Strengths	Weaknesses	
	Hanna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works as Human Rights Advisor. • Clearly knowledgeable in the field. • Explains the issue well. • Tone is clear and understanding (uses terminology of the field of study). • Use of statistics • The use of a rhetorical question • Other relevant response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of past actions. given but nothing specific. • Offers solutions but these are vague. • Lack of citation • Bias Other relevant response.	
	AO1 Analysis			
AO1 Evaluation			8	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>A government wants to improve access to the internet for the citizens in their country.</p> <p>The following actions are being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer free computers to people in poverty. • Provide computer education in schools. • Encourage charities to provide internet access to the local community. <p>Which <u>one</u> of these actions would you recommend to the government, and why?</p> <p>In your answer, you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state your recommendation • give reasons and evidence to support your choice • use the material in the sources and/or any of your own ideas • consider different arguments and perspectives. <p>Main Annotations EXP P R J</p> <p>Tables G, H and I</p> <p>Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks																					
4	<p data-bbox="304 241 424 280">Table G</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 315 1318 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 315 440 416"></th> <th data-bbox="440 315 1182 416">Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</th> <th data-bbox="1182 315 1318 416"></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 416 440 481">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 416 1182 481">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 416 1318 481">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 481 440 719">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 481 1182 719"> Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 481 1318 719">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 719 440 956">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 719 1182 956"> Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 719 1318 956">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 956 440 1193">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 956 1182 1193"> Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 956 1318 1193">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1193 440 1462">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1193 1182 1462"> Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are tangential or not relevant to the issue in the question. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1193 1318 1462">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1462 440 1518">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1462 1182 1518">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1462 1318 1518">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)		Level	Description	Marks	4	Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question. 	7–8	3	Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question. 	5–6	2	Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question. 	3–4	1	Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are tangential or not relevant to the issue in the question. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	
	Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)																						
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question. 	7–8																					
3	Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question. 	5–6																					
2	Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question. 	3–4																					
1	Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support the candidate's argument. • Evidence and reasons are tangential or not relevant to the issue in the question. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks																					
4	<p>Table H</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 315 1318 1462"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 315 1318 380">Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 380 440 445">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 380 1182 445">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 380 1318 445">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 445 440 683">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 445 1182 683"> <p>Convincing and clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Well-structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 445 1318 683">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 683 440 920">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 683 1182 920"> <p>Clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 683 1318 920">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 920 440 1158">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 920 1182 1158"> <p>Some reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Some consideration of different perspectives or actions. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 920 1318 1158">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1158 440 1395">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 1158 1182 1395"> <p>Limited reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Little or no consideration of different perspectives or actions. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1158 1318 1395">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1395 440 1462">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1395 1182 1462">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1395 1318 1462">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	<p>Convincing and clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Well-structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	7–8	3	<p>Clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	5–6	2	<p>Some reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Some consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	3–4	1	<p>Limited reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Little or no consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	1–2	0	No creditable response	0	
Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
4	<p>Convincing and clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Well-structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	7–8																					
3	<p>Clear reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	5–6																					
2	<p>Some reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Some consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	3–4																					
1	<p>Limited reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument. • Little or no consideration of different perspectives or actions. 	1–2																					
0	No creditable response	0																					

Question	Answer	Marks																											
4	<p>Table I</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 315 1318 1081"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 315 1318 380">Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 380 440 445">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 380 1182 445">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 380 1318 445">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 445 440 613">4</td> <td data-bbox="440 445 1182 613"> Judgements are fully supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 445 1318 613">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 613 440 748">3</td> <td data-bbox="440 613 1182 748"> Judgements are supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 613 1318 748">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 748 440 916">2</td> <td data-bbox="440 748 1182 916"> Judgements are partly supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 748 1318 916">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 916 440 1016">1</td> <td data-bbox="440 916 1182 1016"> Asserted judgements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are asserted and not explained. </td> <td data-bbox="1182 916 1318 1016">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1016 440 1081">0</td> <td data-bbox="440 1016 1182 1081">No creditable response</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1016 1318 1081">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the recommended course of action using reasons and evidence to justify their choice. Candidates may use and develop material found in Sources 1 to 4 but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without interpretation. Other material may be introduced but is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates may consider some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to scale of impact on digital communication Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government. How long it might take to make a difference. Barriers to change. The influence of individuals and groups on decision making. The role of vested interests and power differences. Potential conflicts of interest. Difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements. Cost and access to resources to implement change. Other reasonable response. <table border="1" data-bbox="290 1861 1342 2047"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="290 1861 1342 1924">AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1861 1461 1924">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="290 1924 1342 1989">AO1 Develop a line of reasoning</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1924 1461 1989">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="290 1989 1342 2047">AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1989 1461 2047">4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	4	Judgements are fully supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. 	4	3	Judgements are supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. 	3	2	Judgements are partly supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument. 	2	1	Asserted judgements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are asserted and not explained. 	1	0	No creditable response	0	AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments	8	AO1 Develop a line of reasoning	8	AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action	4	
Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)																													
Level	Description	Marks																											
4	Judgements are fully supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. 	4																											
3	Judgements are supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument. 	3																											
2	Judgements are partly supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument. 	2																											
1	Asserted judgements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements are asserted and not explained. 	1																											
0	No creditable response	0																											
AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments	8																												
AO1 Develop a line of reasoning	8																												
AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action	4																												