



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/11

Paper 1 Written Exam

October/November 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 October/November 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **20** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****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.

**PUBLISHED****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.

**PUBLISHED****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.

**PUBLISHED****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.

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	<b>Correct, creditworthy point.</b> Used in Question 1 only.
	<b>Incorrect point.</b> Used in Question 1 or for clear error elsewhere. Also used to show no creditable material – the equivalent of L0.
	<b>Unclear/confused point</b>
<b>ND</b>	<b>Needs developing.</b> When used alone <b>simply</b> identifies a point made without development. Used in all questions.
<b>ND+ or ND-</b>	<b>Partially developed strength (ND+) or weakness (ND-).</b> Used for <b>general</b> , supported points in Question 2. [ND and + or – added separately]
<b>+ or -</b>	<b>Fully developed strength or weakness.</b> Used for <b>fully</b> supported points in Question 2.
<b>ND EVAL</b>	<b>Partially Developed Evaluation.</b> Used in Question 3 to show where <b>general</b> points are made.
<b>EVAL</b>	<b>Fully Developed Evaluation.</b> Explanation and illustration, <b>fully</b> supporting points in Question 3.
<b>C</b>	<b>Comparison of content.</b> Used in Question 3 when <b>no evaluation</b> ; <b>simply</b> comparison of documents
<b>J</b>	<b>Judgement.</b> Used alone as <b>J</b> to show <b>full</b> judgement, or as <b>ND J</b> , to show <b>partial</b> judgement. Especially used in Question 3.
	<b>Not answering the question.</b> For example, when introducing own knowledge.
	<b>Repetition.</b> When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
<b>L1 L2 L3</b>	<b>Level 1, 2 or 3 response.</b> Used in Question 2 and Question 3 to allocate a level for <b>each criterion</b> in the levels tables. They can be used together, like <b>L3/L2 to show a split grade</b> . Used alone to give overall level for the question. (See guidance on last 4 pages)
	<b>On Page Comment.</b> Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

**PUBLISHED**

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:

- (a) Mark grids describe the top of each level.
- (b) **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
- (c) **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**

<b>AO1</b> <b>Research, analysis and evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li><li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li><li>• synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li><li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives</li></ul>
--	---

**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**

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Romani children cannot be registered at birth.</b></p> <p><b>Identify two impacts of this, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><b>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.</b></p> </div> <p><b>Credit one mark each for up to 2 relevant impacts.</b></p> <p>These impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They cannot get hospital treatment / (free) healthcare ✓</li> <li>• They cannot go to school / reach maturity without attending school ✓</li> <li>• When they grow up, they cannot register their own children / statelessness passes from generation to generation ✓</li> </ul> <p>Answers must be specifically linked to the impact on children of not being registered at birth (not having a birth certificate)</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are excluded through racism.</li> <li>• Roma 'traditional lifestyle'</li> </ul> <p>Do <b>not</b> credit reasons that Roma might not want to register children at birth.</p>	<b>2</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(b)	<b>The author of Document 1 predicts consequences if statelessness is not addressed.</b>	
1(b)(i)	<p><b>Identify two of these consequences for adults.</b></p> <div data-bbox="349 357 1928 461" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>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.</b></p> </div> <p><b>Credit up to 2 marks each for identification of two consequences of statelessness for adults: Consequences identified may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More parents will be forced into less and less secure work (to feed their families) ✓</li> <li>• More Roma will be pushed to the margins of society. ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Romani children will reach maturity without attending school.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)(ii)	<p><b>Explain one of these consequences.</b></p> <p><b>Credit up to 2 marks for an explanation of <u>one</u> of the consequences of statelessness for adults:</b> Scoring at b(ii) is not contingent upon scoring at b (i) <b>Explanation may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more parents will be forced into less and less secure work because they need to feed their families ✓ (simple) and without ID and legal status, they are unable to register for legal work. ✓ (developed)</li> </ul> <p><b>Or:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more Roma will be pushed to the margins of society without work or legitimate sources of income, ✓ (simple) they will continue to be seen as people who do not want to be part of the system and as outsiders. ✓ (developed)</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: Accept any logical explanation given by the candidate. Answers should be in the candidate's own words. This requires using the text not just quoting it. This might involve correct <i>paraphrase</i>, correct <i>precis</i> or correct <i>synthesis</i> of the text. Answers that synthesise two directly copied sections from different parts of the document could be awarded two marks if creating a logical explanation.</b></p> <p><b>Do not credit explanation marks where a candidate uses their own knowledge.</b></p>	<b>2</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence given by the author to support his views about statelessness in Document 1.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The following strengths of evidence support his argument about statelessness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Uses relevant evidence and examples to support the conclusion:</b> Elena’s testimonial, the story of her life and the supporting evidence about the historical background all support the argument that statelessness leads to marginalisation.</li> <li>• <b>Quotes sources with authority:</b> European Roma Rights Centre/ UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (gives confidence to reader)</li> <li>• <b>Author’s provenance:</b> Incl. Romani / works for ERRC (experience/ first-hand knowledge and access to facts and figures)</li> <li>• <b>Historical context:</b> sets the scene (Elena’s father and the impact of Balkan war) helps us to understand the situation.</li> <li>• <b>Detailed explanations and first-hand reports:</b> Elena, Đorđe Jovanović, Stefan help us to empathise with the Roma and make the argument ‘real’ to us.</li> </ul>	10

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <p>The following weaknesses of evidence undermine the author’s argument and serve to weaken it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Much anecdotal and unsupported evidence:</b> Though the first-hand accounts of Elena and Stefan increase sympathy for their situation, they are also word of mouth without supporting facts and figures. <i>Roma without citizenship rights live shorter, harder and much more unfulfilled lives.</i> (No supporting figures or detail of how this has been measured/ who they are compared with)</li> <li>• <b>Some sweeping statements:</b> <i>Because of her ethnicity, she faces daily discrimination.</i> <i>Many government officials hold a stereotypical view</i></li> <li>• <b>Narrow range of sources:</b> Lack of evidence from state officials gives an unbalanced account. All sources are of the same view.</li> <li>• <b>Bias:</b> As a Romani himself, and only taking evidence from Roma, the argument is likely to be biased.</li> <li>• <b>Vested Interest:</b> His post as Communications Co-ordinator for the ERRC depends on the perception that the Roma do not have rights, and this may lead him to exaggerate in presenting evidence or give a one-sided view, being selective in what he presents, to continue working in the field.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>The authors of Documents 1 and 2 present different views on statelessness. To what extent are the author's views in Document 2 more convincing than those of the author in Document 1?</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</b> No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>More convincing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Viewpoint is more detached:</b> As an academic and not personally impacted by the issue, Swider (Doc 2) is more likely to present an accurate and balanced view than Lee (Doc 1) who is much more personally involved.</li> <li>• <b>More global perspective</b> Swider (Doc 2) includes information from the Netherlands and about Armenia and uses the example of the international policy on slums to support her argument about the misuse of human rights policies. Lee (Doc 1) concentrates on the Roma in Eastern Europe, which limits his perspective.</li> <li>• <b>More support from sources of authority:</b> Swider (Doc 2) uses sources including UNCRS, Marie Huchsermeyer and mentions the UNHCR campaign and gives more detail of what they say – supporting her viewpoint, whereas Lee (Doc 2) only gives details of what someone from the ERRC (Đorđe Jovanović) says, without any indication of what his colleague's role is.</li> <li>• <b>Balanced view on benefits of nationality:</b> Swider presents a clear picture of the possible disadvantages of nationality – the example of the Armenian, her argument that people need human rights first and that nationality should be a matter of choice is more balanced and convincing than Lee's view that nationality will end all the Roma's problems.</li> </ul>	14

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Less Convincing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Less emotional style:</b> Doc 2 (Swider) is written in a more detached way and has less direct appeal to our emotions. The perspective is more distant than Lee's (Doc 1) who uses the words of people directly impacted by this issue to give a much more emotional and more convincing view.</li> <li>• <b>Less direct experience/expertise:</b> Swider (Doc 2) is an academic and is writing from an academic view. This makes her less convincing in her opinions than Lee (Doc1) who works in the field, is from this minority and has interviewed people with direct experience of the issue.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of consideration of the impact of statelessness:</b> Because her view is that the issue is about human rights and that nationality is not so important, Swider (Doc 2) does not consider the difficulties faced by those without nationality. She seems to skim over them, whereas Lee's view (Doc 1) is more convincing as he gives details of people's day to day struggles.</li> <li>• <b>Uses unrelated evidence</b> Swider (Doc 2) uses evidence from a professor of Architecture and Planning related to slum clearance which is not clearly linked to the argument about statelessness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Neither More or Less convincing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Convincing examples:</b> Both authors use details of real-life examples (not just facts and figures) to support their views (Elena + Stefan, the 'Armenian', slum-clearance) and make the situation real to the reader.</li> <li>• <b>Attitude to stateless people:</b> Both authors have a sympathetic view of stateless people and want the best for them.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of balance:</b> Neither author includes any opposing views or counterarguments in their argument.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p><b>Judgement</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of evidence and examples to reach a judgement.</p> <p>They may conclude that both are equally convincing, that they have a similar balance of strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>They may conclude that Lee’s views in Document 1 are more convincing because he gives a much clearer picture of how Roma themselves feel and are impacted by statelessness.</p> <p>They may conclude that Swider’s views in Document 2 are more convincing because she is less involved and takes more of an overview, she is sympathetic but realistic and less emotional.</p> <p>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.</p>	

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 10 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.]**

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

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained, and a judgement is reached</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weakness, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but <b>generalised, not always linked</b> to specific claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of evidence.</li> <li>• Assessment, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b>, and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> - response may be <b>cursorly</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - How much assessment there is
  - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment
  - 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 8 marks out of 10.

- 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 (8) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.
- Other examples:

○ e.g.                   L3    L3    L3    L3    Overall Level 3 – Mark 10

This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3.

○ e.g.                   L2    L1    L2    L1    Overall Level 2 – Mark 5

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 4

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 8

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 8.

○ e.g.                   L1    X    L1    L1    Overall Level 1 – Mark 2

Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

**PUBLISHED**

- **In level 2 there is a range of 4 marks so use all 4 criteria to make your judgement.**
- **In Level 3 and level 1 there is a range of 3 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 3 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 14 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	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic/undeveloped</b>. Answers may <b>describe</b> a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>
X	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

**PUBLISHED**

- 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 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 – 10.
- Other examples:
  - e.g. L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 9  
Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (9 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met.
  - e.g. L2 L2 L1 L1 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 7  
Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades bringing it to a mid L2 i.e. 7
  
- 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 level 2 and level 3 there is a range of 5 marks so use all 5 criteria to make your judgement.**
- **In level 1 there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**