



Cambridge International AS Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/12

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.

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. Also used to show no creditable material – the equivalent of L0.
	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.
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:

- 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

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Identify <u>two</u> negative impacts of urbanisation, as given by the author of Document 1.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>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.</p> </div> <p>Credit 1 mark each, for up to 2 negative impacts, identified: [2 × 1]</p> <p>Credit correct versions of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worsening economic inequality ✓ • Poor urban infrastructure such as unreliable power supplies ✓ / congested roads ✓ / inadequate schools ✓ • Unsanitary conditions (slums) ✓ <p>NB Accept any negative impact from any part of the text as long as it is clearly an impact of urbanisation.</p> <p>Do not credit neutral or positive impacts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More young adults • Highest levels of development 	2

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Explain how cities are addressing poverty, as given by the author of Document 1.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>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.</p> </div> <p>Credit up to 2 marks for a logical explanation of any measure taken to address poverty: [2 × 1]</p> <p>Cities are introducing initiatives to address poverty such as (the Family Rewards initiative in New York) where financial help has been given ✓ (to support education and training for work and also to access healthcare) (Simple). Better health, education and training will help people in poor households to improve their lives, find work and reduce their poverty. ✓ (Developed)</p> <p>Simple explanation may be copied directly from the document. Developed explanations should be in the candidate's own words. It requires use of 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.</p> <p>Do not credit explanation marks where a candidate uses their own knowledge.</p> <p>NB Accept any initiative from any part of the text as long as it clearly addresses poverty.</p> <p>No marks</p> <p>Do not credit explanations of initiatives to improve infrastructure or the environment, with no clear link to poverty:</p> <p>For example, this is not linked to poverty. <i>Cities are introducing initiatives to improve infrastructure; about 1600 cities are mapping main sources of air pollution and taking measures to improve air quality. This makes the city environment much healthier and more pleasant to live in.</i></p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>Identify <u>two</u> measures governments need to take to respond to challenges of rapid urbanisation, as given by the author of Document 1.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>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.</p> </div> <p><u>Credit 1 mark each</u>, for <u>up to 2</u> measures governments need to take, identified: [2 × 1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments will need to supply necessary public services and infrastructure ✓ • Governments must design a national urbanisation strategy✓ (To identify urban development priorities / to plan and co-ordinate actions by everyone involved). <p>NB Accept any measures mentioned by the author as long as they are clearly future possible measures and not already in place.</p> <p>No marks</p> <p><u>Do not credit</u> measures already in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide cash incentives for preventive health care. • Take effective measures to improve air quality <p><u>Nor</u> candidate's own ideas based on issues raise in the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve power systems • Improve ports • Improve public transport • Improve schools • Increase cities' competitiveness. 	2

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document 1 to support his views on urbanisation.</p> <p>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Strengths: The following strengths of evidence support his views about urbanisation:</p> <p>Provenance of author:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He is Deputy Director of UNHDR and so likely to have access to reliable data on urbanisation and to have the expertise to select relevant evidence to support his views. <p>Relevant data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He supports his views with relevant data such as Cities generate more than 80 % of GDP / Urban growth rates: Africa: 40% to 56% Asia 48% to 64% by 2050 USD 57 trillion needed for global infrastructure by 2030. <p>Relevant facts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He supports his view that governments must become more strategic by providing a range of challenges that face urban areas and by listing the issues many urban dwellers face now. <p>Examples of present-day initiatives: Details of the Opportunity NYC and UN Habitat initiatives give weight to his view that urban life can be improved if proper planning is adopted.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The following weaknesses of evidence undermine the author’s argument and serve to weaken it:</p> <p>Unsupported claims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palanivel claims that countries with the highest urban populations tend to be the richest and most developed. Without specific data to support this claim, it seems unlikely. • Palanivel claims that rapid and unplanned urbanisation creates income and opportunity inequality. However, he gives no evidence, examples or explanation of this claim. 	10

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Vague figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palanivel provides some vague or inexact figures such as <i>About 1600 cities, more than two-thirds of the world's population, Nearly 40%,</i> • Palanivel gives generalised figures without specifying where or exactly what he is talking about: <i>Africa and Asia will have the fastest urban growth rates</i> (a large area so the figures are very generalised) <i>More than 1 billion people live... Almost 700 million urban slum dwellers...</i> without saying where these people live. • Palanivel gives projected figures such as <i>Africa's population is projected to jump to 56% by 2050.</i> These are estimates that may be too vague to create current policies. <p>Unsupported conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palanivel's conclusion is that future human development depends on how well urbanisation is managed. However, he has not provided evidence that well-managed urbanisation leads to human development. <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 data-bbox="336 217 1713 248">To what extent is the argument in Document 2 more convincing than the argument in Document 1?</p> <p data-bbox="336 284 1131 316">Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</p> <p data-bbox="336 320 1839 384">No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p data-bbox="336 419 582 451">More convincing:</p> <p data-bbox="336 486 1052 518">In-depth consideration of urbanisation of Australia:</p> <p data-bbox="336 523 1937 619">Searle (Doc 2) concentrates on the situation in Australia and is able to provide a wide range of specific examples to support his argument. Palanivel (Doc 1) is taking a more general perspective and so fails to give many real and specific examples making Doc 2 much more convincing.</p> <p data-bbox="336 654 884 686">Balance between realities and the ideal</p> <p data-bbox="336 691 1926 754">Searle (Doc 1) recognises that Australia has specific issues related to the tax system that leave local areas without enough money to do the things they should, thus letting in private interests.</p> <p data-bbox="336 759 1926 887">Searle (Doc 2) recognises that planning is in place but that it is inadequate due to vested interests, (hints at corruption). He takes a more realistic view than Palanivel (Doc 1) who implies that planning and managing urban environments will solve urban problems as they are caused only by lack of planning. Searle's more realistic argument is more convincing than the more idealistic argument of Palanivel (Doc 1)</p> <p data-bbox="336 922 627 954">Supporting evidence</p> <p data-bbox="336 959 1915 1086">Searle (Doc 2) provides detailed evidence of failures of planning and the impact of vested interests in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth. He compares the poor planning of public transport in Sydney with overseas cities where inefficient motorways are no longer built. This strengthens his argument and makes it more convincing than the more limited examples provided by Palanivel in Document 1.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1161 571 1193">Less convincing:</p> <p data-bbox="336 1228 952 1260">Less clear /convincing conclusion/solution:</p> <p data-bbox="336 1265 1937 1393">Searle (Doc 2) concludes by hinting that vested interests will get in the way of solving the problem of excessive urban growth. However, he implies that national government will be able to solve the problem by getting involved in planning. This seems contradictory and weakens his argument as compared to Palanivel (Doc 1) whose message is consistent: that strategic planning is the way to go to solve the problems of rapid urbanisation.</p>	14

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Provenance: Searle (Doc 2) is an academic and though he is an Associate Professor in Planning, we cannot be confident that he has any experience of planning in the real world. Palanivel (Doc 1) is Deputy Director of the UNHDR office and has access to the advice and opinions of experts and reports, from around the world, on real-life initiatives and projects. This makes him more convincing than Searle and the reader is likely to feel that he has more relevant real-world experience of the issue.</p> <p>Publication: Palanivel (Doc 1)'s article was published by the UNDP and is likely to be a well-researched, formal document. Searle (Doc 2) is writing in the Conversation and seems to be giving his own opinion and being somewhat controversial. This makes Searle's argument seem less formal and so less convincing than Palanivel's.</p> <p>The same, neither more or less convincing:</p> <p>Expertise: Both authors are likely to have a high level of expertise in Urbanisation as one works in the UNHDR and the other is an academic in the subject area of Planning.</p> <p>Access to information Both authors are likely to have access to relevant information and the expertise to select appropriate evidence and to understand relevant concepts to support their arguments.</p> <p>Vested interest/reputation Both authors have a vested interest to present valid arguments and accurate information due to their professional standing, as to do otherwise would be to risk their reputations.</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

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Judgement 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, though different, they have a similar balance of strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>They may conclude that Document 1 is more convincing as the author presents a global argument, with figures for the whole world, showing that he has a global perspective and access to information about global trends.</p> <p>They may conclude that Document 2 is more convincing as he is clearly more passionate about the topic. He seems to be more realistic about the realities of vested interest and the present situation in Australia but is able to compare this to other cities around the world.</p>	

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"> • Both strengths and weaknesses 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	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers focus more on either the strengths or weakness, 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 is limited, but clearly expressed.
L1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers show little or no assessment of evidence. • Assessment, if any, is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified, and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited - response may be cursory or descriptive.
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no creditable material.

- 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.

PUBLISHED

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

Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

- 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.

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 14 marks

Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:

- ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed,
- ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents)
- 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.)
- C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation. (e.g. X said ‘this’ and Y said ‘that’)
- ? for an unclear or confused answer
- J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

PUBLISHED

L1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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.**